arXiv:1607.02201v1 [math.ST] 8 Jul 2016

EIGENVALUE DISTRIBUTIONS OF VARIANCE COMPONENTS ESTIMATORS IN HIGH-DIMENSIONAL RANDOM EFFECTS MODELS

ZHOU FAN AND IAIN M. JOHNSTONE

Abstract. We study the spectra of MANOVA estimators and other quadratic estimators for variance component covariance matrices in multivariate random effects models. When the dimensionality of the observations is large and comparable to both the number of samples and the number of realizations of each random effect, the empirical eigenvalue distributions of such estimators are well-approximated by deterministic laws. The Stieltjes transforms of these laws may be characterized by systems of fixed-point equations, which are numerically solvable by a simple iterative procedure. Our derivation of this characterization uses operator-valued free probability theory, and we establish a general asymptotic freeness result for families of rectangular orthogonally-invariant random matrices, which is of independent interest. Our work is motivated by the estimation of components of covariance between multiple phenotypic traits in quantitative genetics, and we specialize our results to common experimental designs that arise in this application.

1. Introduction

Since the seminal work of R. A. Fisher, random effects (a.k.a. variance components) linear models have played a foundational role in quantitative genetics. Fisher described how the total variance of a quantitative trait in a population can be decomposed as the sum of various genetic and environmental components of variance, and that these components contribute differently to the covariances of the trait between individuals having different familial relationships. Thus, by examining the trait in individuals of different relations, the components of variance may be statistically estimated [Fis18]. An important motivation for estimating these components of phenotypic variance is in predicting the evolutionary response of a population to natural or artificial selection. If an episode of selection changes the mean value of a trait in the current generation by S, the change $\Delta\mu$ inherited by the next generation is predicted by the breeders' equation $\Delta\mu = \sigma_A^2(\sigma_z^2)^{-1}S$, where σ_z^2 is the total population variance of the trait and σ_A^2 is the additive genetic component of this variance. This genetic variance σ_A^2 may be estimated by a variance component in a random effects linear model with a suitable experimental design (such as, e.g., the between-group variance in a "half-sib" one-way classification design) [LW98].

In reality, selection acting on a trait rarely only induces a response in that single trait, but instead also affects genetically correlated traits [LA83, PA89, Blo07]. Most of the genetic correlation between different phenotypic traits is likely due to pleiotropy, the influence of a single gene on multiple traits, and there is evidence that pleiotropic effects are widespread across the phenome [Bar90, WB09, MCM$^+$14, BM15, BAC$^+$15]. Letting $S \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denote the changes in mean values of p traits in the current generation due to selection, the changes inherited by the next generation are predicted by the multivariate breeders' equation $\Delta\mu = GP^{-1}S$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$ is the total phenotypic covariance of the p traits and $G \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$ is the additive genetic component of this covariance [LA83]. Due to pleiotropy, G is typically not diagonal. The response to selection may be understood via the principal components of G and the alignment of the "selection gradient" $P^{-1}S$

Department of Statistics, Stanford University

E-mail addresses: zhoufan@stanford.edu, imj@stanford.edu.

ZF is supported by a Hertz Foundation Fellowship and an NDSEG Fellowship (DoD, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, 32 CFR 168a). ZF and IMJ are also supported in part by NIH grant R01 EB001988.

with these principal components. Hence, there is significant interest in understanding the spectral structure of G corresponding to various trait sets [Kir09, WB09, HMB14, BM15]. Analogously to the univariate setting, G may be estimated using variance component covariance matrices in multivariate random effects models.

Gene expression microarrays have enabled the measurements of thousands of different quantitative phenotypic traits in a single experimental study, providing an opportunity to better understand the nature and extent of pleiotropy and the effective dimensionality of possible evolutionary response in the entire phenome of an organism [MCM+14, BAC+15]. However, the theory of large random matrices [PA14] as well as numerical simulations [BM15] both suggest that variance component matrices estimated in these settings may exhibit significant spectral noise due to their high dimensionality. It is important in applications to understand the effect of this noise. For sample covariance matrices that directly estimate a population covariance matrix using random samples distributed with that covariance, the eigenvalue distribution of the estimate is characterized by the Marcenko-Pastur equation [MP67]. In this work, we derive an analogous characterization of the spectral distribution of variance component covariance estimators in random effects models.

We study the general multivariate random effects model

$$Y = X\beta + \sum_{r=1}^{k} U_r \alpha_r, \qquad \alpha_r \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathrm{Id}_{I_r} \otimes \Sigma_r). \tag{1}$$

$Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ represents n samples of a p-dimensional observable, modeled as a sum of fixed effects $X\beta$ and k random effects $U_1\alpha_1, \ldots, U_k\alpha_k$.[†] $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is a known design matrix, and for each r, $U_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times I_r}$ is a known incidence matrix and $\alpha_r \in \mathbb{R}^{I_r\times p}$ is an unobserved random matrix with I_r i.i.d. rows distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_r)$. The fixed-effects regression coefficients $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times p}$ and the variance component matrices $\Sigma_r \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$ are unknown model parameters. We study estimators of Σ_r that are quadratic in Y and invariant with respect to β, i.e. estimators of the form

$$\hat{\Sigma} = Y^T B Y, \qquad (BX = 0) \tag{2}$$

for some symmetric matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. In particular, model (1) encompasses nested and crossed classification designs, and (2) encompasses MANOVA estimators and MINQUEs for such designs, discussed further in Section 2. We consider the asymptotic regime where $n, I_1, \ldots, I_k \to \infty$ proportionally. For classification designs, this means that the number of groups at the highest level of division scales proportionally with n, and all further sub-divisions remain bounded in size. This is the relevant regime for experiments that estimate components of phenotypic covariance, from considerations of both experimental practicality and optimal design [Rob59a, Rob59b].

Our main result confirms that when the number of traits p is large and of comparable size to $n, I_1, \ldots, I_k$, quadratic estimators of Σ_r are not asymptotically consistent and do indeed exhibit non-vanishing spectral noise due to their high-dimensionality. The spectra of these estimators are accurately predicted by deterministic probability distributions, which depend on the true variance components $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$. We characterize these deterministic distributions by systems of fixed-point equations in their Stieltjes transforms. These equations generalize the Marcenko-Pastur equation to the variance components setting and may be solved numerically to yield the corresponding probability density functions.

In the setting of sample covariance matrices, the Marcenko-Pastur equation and the relationship between the spectrum of the population covariance matrix to that of its sample estimate underpin many procedures for inferring the population spectrum [Kar08, Mes08, RMSE08, LW12, BCY10] and debiasing sample eigenvalues in "spiked" covariance models [BS06, Pau07, BGN11, BY12]. Similar inferential questions are of interest in quantitative genetics applications, and we hope that

[†]It is common to write this model with an additional residual error term ε; for notational convenience we incorporate ε by allowing the last random effect to be $U_k = \mathrm{Id}$ and $\alpha_k = \varepsilon$.

the result of this paper will lead to further insight on spectral inference in the variance components setting.

1.1. **Main result.** To avoid unnecessary convergence assumptions for the true variance component matrices $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$, we state our result in a "deterministic equivalent" form commonly found in the engineering literature [HLN07, CDS11]. Let us present an analogy in the simpler sample covariance matrix setting: Given $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ consisting of n i.i.d. rows with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, consider the sample covariance estimate $\hat{\Sigma} = n^{-1} Y^T Y$. The eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}$ are predicted by the Marcenko-Pastur equation, a result which we may state in the following form:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\lambda_1(\hat{\Sigma}), \dots, \lambda_p(\hat{\Sigma})$ denote the eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}$, and let $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}} = p^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^p \delta_{\lambda_i(\hat{\Sigma})}$ denote its empirical spectral measure. Suppose $n, p \to \infty$ such that $c < p/n < C$ and $\|\Sigma\| < C$ for some constants $C, c > 0$. Then for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, there exists a unique value $m_0(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ satisfying*

$$m_0(z) = \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\left(\left(1 - \frac{p}{n} - \frac{p}{n} z m_0(z) \right) \Sigma - z \operatorname{Id}_p \right)^{-1} \right], \tag{3}$$

and $m_0 : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \mathbb{C}^+$ defines the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure μ_0 on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}} - \mu_0 \to 0$ weakly almost surely.

Recall that the Stieltjes transform $m : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \mathbb{C}^+$ of a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$m(z) = \int \frac{1}{\lambda - z} \mu(d\lambda), \tag{4}$$

and that m uniquely determines μ via the Stieltjes inversion formula. The result of Theorem 1.1 is commonly stated assuming convergence of p/n to a constant $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and of the empirical spectral measure of Σ to a weak limit μ^*, in which case $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ converges to a fixed weak limit characterized by γ and μ^* (see e.g. [SB95].) Theorem 1.1 replaces the former convergence assumptions with only boundedness assumptions, and instead approximates $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ by a "deterministic equivalent" μ_0 that depends directly on Σ, p, and n. This formulation is arguably more relevant for applications, since in practice one would typically obtain the analytic prediction for the spectrum of $\hat{\Sigma}$ from Σ using (3), rather than first passing to a limit measure μ^* for Σ. (See also the discussion in [Kar08].)

The sample covariance matrix setting is in fact a special case of (1) and (2) with $k = 1$, where $X = 0$, $U_1 = \mathrm{Id}$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma$, and $B = n^{-1} \operatorname{Id}_n$. The main result of our paper is the following generalization of Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 1.2. *In the model (1), fix $k \geq 1$, let $\hat{\Sigma} = Y^T B Y$ where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfies $BX = 0$, and let $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}} = p^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^p \delta_{\lambda_i(\hat{\Sigma})}$ denote the empirical spectral measure of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Suppose $n, p, I_1, \dots, I_k \to \infty$ such that $c < p/n < C$, $c < I_r/n < C$, $n\|B\| < C$, $\|\Sigma_r\| < C$, and $\|U_r\| < C$ for each $r = 1, \dots, k$ and some constants $C, c > 0$. Then:*

(a) For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, there exist unique values $a_1(z), \dots, a_k(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$ and $b_1(z), \dots, b_k(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ that satisfy, for $r = 1, \dots, k$, the equations

$$a_r(z) = -\frac{1}{I_r} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\left(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^k b_s(z) \Sigma_s \right)^{-1} \Sigma_r \right), \tag{5}$$

$$b_r(z) = -\frac{1}{I_r} \operatorname{Tr} \left(\left(\operatorname{Id}_{I_1 + \dots + I_k} + M D(a_1(z), \dots, a_k(z)) \right)^{-1} M \right)_{r,r}, \tag{6}$$

where $M, D(a_1(z), \dots, a_k(z)) \in \mathbb{R}^{(I_1 + \dots + I_k) \times (I_1 + \dots + I_k)}$ are defined as

$$M = \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \sqrt{I_2} U_2 \mid \cdots \mid \sqrt{I_k} U_k \right)^T B \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \sqrt{I_2} U_2 \mid \cdots \mid \sqrt{I_k} U_k \right),$$

$$D(a_1(z), \dots, a_k(z)) = \operatorname{diag}(a_1(z) \operatorname{Id}_{I_1}, \dots, a_k(z) \operatorname{Id}_{I_k}),$$

and where $\operatorname{Tr}(A)_{r,r}$ *for* $A \in \mathbb{R}^{(I_1+\ldots+I_k)\times(I_1+\ldots+I_k)}$ *denotes the trace of the* r^{th} *diagonal block of* A *(of size* $I_r \times I_r$*).*

(b) Let

$$m_0(z) = -\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_s(z)\Sigma_s\right)^{-1}\right). \tag{7}$$

Then $m_0 : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \mathbb{C}^+$ *defines the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure* μ_0 *on* $\mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}} - \mu_0 \to 0$ *weakly almost surely.*

Comparing Theorem 1.2 with Theorem 1.1, the fixed-point equation (3) in m_0 is replaced by a system of $2k+1$ equations (5–7) in the $2k+1$ variables $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k, m_0$. In the sample covariance setting of $k = 1$, $U_1 = \operatorname{Id}$, $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma$, and $B = n^{-1}\operatorname{Id}$, equations (5–7) reduce to

$$a_1(z) = -\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}\left((z\operatorname{Id}_p + b_1(z)\Sigma)^{-1}\Sigma\right), \quad b_1(z) = -\frac{1}{1+a_1(z)}, \quad m_0(z) = -\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left((z\operatorname{Id}_p + b_1(z)\Sigma)^{-1}\right),$$

which imply (by the identity $A^{-1} - (A+B)^{-1} = A^{-1}B(A+B)^{-1}$)

$$-1 - \frac{1}{b_1(z)} = a_1(z) = -\frac{z}{nb_1(z)}\operatorname{Tr}\left((z\operatorname{Id}_p)^{-1} - (z\operatorname{Id}_p + b_1(z)\Sigma)^{-1}\right) = -\frac{p}{nb_1(z)} + \frac{pzm_0(z)}{nb_1(z)}.$$

Hence $b_1(z) = -1 + \frac{p}{n} + \frac{p}{n}zm_0(z)$, which together with the above expression for $m_0(z)$ recovers the Marcenko-Pastur equation (3).

In most cases, (5–7) do not admit a solution in $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k, m_0$ that is expressable in closed analytic form. However, these equations are easily solved numerically:

Theorem 1.3. *For each* $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$*, the values* $a_r(z)$ *and* $b_r(z)$ *in Theorem 1.2(a) are the limits, as* $t \to \infty$*, of the iterative procedure which arbitrarily initializes* $b_1^{(0)}, \ldots, b_k^{(0)} \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ *and iteratively computes* $a_r^{(t)}$ *using (5) with* $b_s^{(t)}$ *in place of* $b_s(z)$*, and* $b_r^{(t+1)}$ *using (6) with* $a_s^{(t)}$ *in place of* $a_s(z)$*.*

Observing that $\frac{1}{\pi}\Im m_0(z)$ is the convolution of μ_0 with a Cauchy distribution of scale $\Im z$ (as is easily verified by taking the imaginary part of both sides of (4)), a close approximation to the density of μ_0 in Theorem 1.2(b) may be obtained by computing $\frac{1}{\pi}\Im m_0(z)$ using the procedure in Theorem 1.3 for points $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ slightly above the real axis.

The statement of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 and the characterization of μ_0 by a system of fixed-point equations in an augmented set of variables are both largely inspired by the study of similar models in the engineering literature on wireless communication channels. In particular, [CDS11] establishes analogous results for the matrix

$$S + \sum_{r=1}^{k} H_r^{1/2} G_r^* B_r G_r H_r^{1/2},$$

where $S, H_r \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ are positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices, $B_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n_r \times n_r}$ are positive semidefinite diagonal matrices, and $G_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n_r \times p}$ are independent random matrices with i.i.d. entries, while the earlier work of [Lix06, Theorem 1.2.1] considers the case where $k = 1$ and $S = 0$ but B_1 can be an arbitrary Hermitian matrix. When $S = 0$, G_r are Gaussian, and $\|H_r\|$ and $\|B_r\|$ are uniformly bounded, these results may be recovered as special cases of our Theorem 4.1 (stated in Section 4). In [DL11] (see also the earlier work of [MS07] using the replica method), the authors study the model

$$W = \sum_{r=1}^{k}\sum_{s=1}^{k} H_r^{1/2} G_r^* T_r^{1/2} T_s^{1/2} G_s H_s^{1/2},$$

where $H_r \in \mathbb{C}^{p\times p}$ and $T_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ are positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices and $G_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times p}$ are independent random matrices with i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries, which is also a special

case of Theorem 4.1. We note that $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (2) may be written in a form similar to W above, but the above model does not handle our setting as our estimation matrix B is frequently not positive semidefinite. Also, [DL11] proves only convergence of the mean Stieltjes transform for W, employing the integration-by-parts formula for Gaussian expectations, and (to our knowledge) convergence in the almost sure sense remained open before our work. The methods of proof in [Lix06, MS07, CDS11, DL11] do not use the free probability approach.

1.2. **Overview of proof.** Our proof of Theorem 1.2 uses tools of operator-valued free probability theory, in particular the notion of rectangular probability spaces and their connection to operator-valued freeness developed in [BG09] and the free deterministic equivalents approach of [SV12].

Let us write α_r in (1) as $\alpha_r = G_r \Sigma_r^{1/2}$, where $G_r \in \mathbb{R}^{I_r \times p}$ has i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries. Then the estimator in (2) may be written as

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} (\Sigma_r^{1/2})^T G_r^T U_r^T B U_s G_s \Sigma_s^{1/2}.$$

Central to our proof is the following observation: If $O_0, O_1, \ldots, O_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $O_{k+r} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_r \times I_r}$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, k$ are real orthogonal matrices, then (as G_r is equal in law to $O_{k+r} G_r O_r^T$) the empirical spectral distribution of $\hat{\Sigma}$ remains invariant in law under the transformations

$$\Sigma_r^{1/2} \mapsto H_r := O_r^T \Sigma_r^{1/2} O_0, \;\; U_r^T B U_s \mapsto B_{r,s} := O_{k+r}^T U_r^T B U_s O_{k+s}.$$

Hence we may equivalently consider the matrix

$$\sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} H_r^T G_r^T B_{r,s} G_s H_s \tag{8}$$

where H_r and $B_{r,s}$ are as defined above for random orthogonal matrices $O_0, \ldots, O_{2k}$ uniformly distributed with respect to Haar measure, independent of each other and of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Then the $k+2$ families of random matrices $\{H_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{B_{r,s} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ are independent of each other, and the matrices within each family satisfy a certain notion of joint orthogonal invariance in law (formalized in Section 3).

The free probability approach is then informally described as follows: As in [BG09], we embed the matrices $\{H_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{B_{r,s} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ into a larger square matrix space $\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$. Let us denote by $\tilde{H}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ the embedding of H_r, etc. We then consider deterministic elements $\{h_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{b_{rs} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $g_1, \ldots, g_k$ that "asymptotically model" the embedded random matrices. The elements h_r, b_{rs}, g_r are not finite-dimensional matrices, but instead may be constructed in a (non-commutative) algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of bounded operators acting on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. $\mathcal{A}$ is endowed with a linear projection $\tau : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ which models the normalized matrix trace, and the sense in which $\{h_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ "models" $\{\tilde{H}_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, etc., is that the difference between the projection under τ of any polynomial in $\{h_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ and the normalized matrix trace of that same polynomial in $\{\tilde{H}_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ converges to 0. In the standard free probability approach, all joint tracial moments of $\{\tilde{H}_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\{\tilde{B}_{r,s} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$ are assumed to converge, and h_r, b_{rs}, g_r may be taken independent of n and p and thought of as certain limit objects of the random matrices. Following the free deterministic equivalents approach of [SV12], we remove this convergence assumption and allow $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ and h_r, b_{rs}, g_r to also depend on n and p; this is analogous to the discussion of deterministic equivalents in Section 1.1.

Corresponding to the observation that the matrix families $\{\tilde{H}_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{\tilde{B}_{r,s} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\tilde{G}_1, \ldots, \tilde{G}_k$ are independent and the matrices within each family satisfy joint orthogonal invariance in law, we take $\{h_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{b_{rs} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$, $g_1, \ldots, g_k$ to be free with amalgamation over a certain subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$, in accordance with [BG09]. (Freeness with amalgamation

[Voi95, Spe98] may be viewed as a non-commutative analogue of the classical notion of conditional independence of random variables over a sub-sigma-field.) The elements $h_r, b_{rs}, g_r \in \mathcal{A}$ form a "free deterministic equivalent" model. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 then consists of the following two steps:

1. For independent families of random matrices satisfying joint orthogonal invariance, we generally define the notion of a free deterministic equivalent model and prove a result establishing asymptotic closeness between elements of this model and the original random matrices.
2. We consider a free deterministic equivalent $\{h_r\}, \{b_{rs}\}, g_1, \ldots, g_k$ for the matrices $\{\tilde{H}_r\}$, $\{\tilde{B}_{r,s}\}$, $\tilde{G}_1, \ldots, \tilde{G}_k$, and we show that the Stieltjes transform of $w := \sum_r \sum_s h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s$ in the free model satisfies the equations (5–7) over a subdomain of $\mathbb{C}^+$.

Existence and uniqueness of the fixed point to (5,6) in the stated domains will be established by standard arguments using the Banach fixed point theorem and uniqueness of analytic continuation. This implies that the Stieltjes transform of w in step 2 is uniquely determined by (5–7), and step 1 then implies that (5–7) asymptotically describe the Stieltjes transform of $\hat{\Sigma}$.

An advantage of the free probability approach is that the approximation arguments are completely separated from the computation of the limiting measure. Approximation is performed in step 1 above, which proves a general asymptotic freeness result that is independent of the specific matrix model. This result may be viewed as belonging to a long line of work establishing conditions under which the spectra of random matrices are well-approximated by free models [Voi91, Dyk93, Voi98, HP00, Col03, CŚ06, BG09, SV12], and we believe that it may prove useful for formalizing results obtained via free probability calculations in other statistical and engineering applications. The derivation of (5–7) for our specific model is performed in step 2 and uses computational tools for operator-valued free cumulants developed in [NSS02, SV12]. In step 2, the Stieltjes transform of w is exactly (rather than approximately) described by (5–7), and hence the computation is entirely algebraic and contains no analytic approximation arguments or bounds.

1.3. **Outline of paper.** Section 2 specializes Theorem 1.2 to several simple classification designs that frequently arise in quantitative genetics applications; computational details are deferred to Appendix A. Section 3 reviews the main concepts of operator-valued free probability theory and states the asymptotic freeness result in step 1 of the above proof outline; the proof of this result is deferred to Appendix B. Step 2 of the above outline and the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are contained in Section 4, with details deferred to Appendix C. Technical details underlying the free probability framework are discussed in Appendix D.

1.4. **Notation.** $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the l_2 norm for vectors and the $l_2 \to l_2$ operator norm for matrices. M^T and M^* denote the transpose and conjugate-transpose of a matrix M, $\operatorname{Tr} M = \sum_i M_{ii}$ denotes the standard matrix trace, Id_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and $\operatorname{diag}(A_1, \ldots, A_k)$ denotes the block-diagonal matrix with diagonal blocks $A_1, \ldots, A_k$. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Re z$ and $\Im z$ denote the real and imaginary parts of z. $\mathbb{C}^+$ denotes $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$, and $\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ denotes $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z \geq 0\}$. $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the integers, and $\mathbb{N}$ denotes $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geq 1\}$. For a $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and elements $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$, $\langle a_i : i \in \mathcal{I} \rangle$ denotes the sub-$*$-algebra generated by $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, i.e. the smallest sub-$*$-algebra that contains these elements. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra, $\langle a_i : i \in \mathcal{I} \rangle_{W^*}$ denotes the von Neumann sub-algebra generated by $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, i.e. the ultraweak closure of $\langle a_i : i \in \mathcal{I} \rangle$.

Acknowledgments. We thank Mark W. Blows for introducing us to this problem and for much help in guiding us through understanding the quantitative genetics applications.

2. Specialization to classification designs

Quadratic estimators of the form (2) encompass generalized MANOVA estimators and MINQUEs for the model (1). Generalized MANOVA estimators are obtained by choosing symmetric matrices

$M_1, \dots, M_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that $M_r X = 0$ for each $r = 1, \dots, k$, and equating each $Y^T M_r Y$ with its expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y^T M_r Y]$ and solving for $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ (see e.g. [SCM09, Chapter 5.2] and [SR74]). As

$$\mathbb{E}[Y^T M_r Y] = \sum_{s=1}^{k} \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s^T U_s^T M_r U_s \alpha_s] = \sum_{s=1}^{k} \operatorname{Tr}(U_s^T M_r U_s)\Sigma_s,$$

which is a linear combination of $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$, all MANOVA estimators take the form (2) for estimation matrices B that are linear combinations of $M_1, \dots, M_k$. The choices of $M_1, \dots, M_k$ are sometimes ad-hoc for unbalanced classification designs and more general models, and MINQUEs (minimum-norm quadratic unbiased estimators) [Rao72, LaM73] are a second class of estimators of the form (2) that instead choose $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ based on a certain optimality criterion.

In many classification designs, $M_1, \dots, M_k$ for MANOVA may be chosen in a standard way such that each matrix $Y^T M_r Y$ corresponds to a between-group or within-group "sum-of-squares". In this section, we specialize Theorem 1.2 to these standard MANOVA estimators in the one-way, balanced nested, and balanced replicated crossed two-way designs. In these and many other examples, the matrices $U_1, \dots, U_k, B$ and hence also equation (6) have a simple form, and we describe this simplification in each case. Detailed computations and some numerical verifications of the results are deferred to Appendix A.

2.1. **One-way classification.** $\{Y_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^p : 1 \le i \le I, 1 \le j \le J_i\}$ represent observations of a p-dimensional response across $n = \sum_{i=1}^{I} J_i$ independent samples, belonging to $I \ge 2$ groups of sizes $J_1, \dots, J_I$. The data are modeled as

$$Y_{i,j} = \mu + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_{i,j}, \tag{9}$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a fixed unknown vector of population mean values, $\alpha_i \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ are random group effects, and $\varepsilon_{i,j} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_2)$ are residual errors. In quantitative genetics, this is the model for the half-sib experimental design in which each group contains individuals sharing a single parent, and also for the standard twin study [KO61] in which each group is comprised of two monozygotic or dizygotic twins [LW98].

Defining the sums-of-squares

$$SS_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{I} J_i(\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y})(\bar{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^T, \quad SS_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{I}\sum_{j=1}^{J_i}(Y_{i,j} - \bar{Y}_i)(Y_{i,j} - \bar{Y}_i)^T,$$

where $\bar{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\bar{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denote the mean in the i^{th} group and of all samples, respectively, the standard MANOVA estimators are given [SCM09, Chapter 3.6] by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_1 = \frac{1}{K}\left(\frac{1}{I-1}SS_1 - \frac{1}{n-I}SS_2\right), \quad \hat{\Sigma}_2 = \frac{1}{n-I}SS_2, \tag{10}$$

where $K = (n - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{I} J_i^2)/(I-1)$. Theorem 1.2 yields the following corollary:[†]

Corollary 2.1. *Assume $p, n, I \to \infty$ such that $c < p/n < C$, $c < I/n < C'$, $\max_{i=1}^{I} J_i \le C$, $\|\Sigma_1\| < C$, and $\|\Sigma_2\| < C$ for some $C, C', c > 0$ with $C' < 1$. Denote $I_1 = I$ and $I_2 = n$. Then:*
(a) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_1} - \mu_0 \to 0$ weakly a.s., for μ_0 having Stieltjes transform $m_0(z)$ determined by

$$a_s(z) = -\frac{1}{I_s}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\,\mathrm{Id} + b_1(z)\Sigma_1 + b_2(z)\Sigma_2\right)^{-1}\Sigma_s\right) \quad \forall s = 1, 2,$$

[†]In the results of this section, we say $m_0(z)$ is "determined by" a system of equations to mean in the sense of Theorem 1.2, i.e. for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ there exists a unique solution to these equations with $a_s(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $b_s(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$, and $m_0(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

$$b_1(z) = -\sum_{i=1}^{I} \frac{J_i}{KI + IJ_i a_1(z) + na_2(z)},$$

$$b_2(z) = \frac{n-I}{K(n-I) - na_2(z)} - \sum_{i=1}^{I} \frac{1}{KI + IJ_i a_1(z) + na_2(z)},$$

$$m_0(z) = -\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}\left((z \operatorname{Id} + b_1(z)\Sigma_1 + b_2(z)\Sigma_2)^{-1} \right).$$

(b) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_2} - \mu_0 \to 0$ weakly a.s., for μ_0 having Stieltjes transform $m_0(z)$ determined by

$$a_2(z) = -\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr}\left((z \operatorname{Id} + b_2(z)\Sigma_2)^{-1} \Sigma_2 \right), \quad b_2(z) = -\frac{n-I}{n-I+na_2(z)},$$

$$m_0(z) = -\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}\left((z \operatorname{Id} + b_2(z)\Sigma_2)^{-1} \right).$$

These equations may be further simplified in the balanced case $J_1 = \ldots = J_I$, where $K = J_1$.

Figure 1 displays the simulated eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ when $J_1 = \ldots = J_I = 4$, for several settings of the true matrices Σ_1 and Σ_2. Overlaid on each histogram is the (appropriately rescaled) density of the measure μ_0 in Corollary 2.1(a), approximated as $\frac{1}{\pi}\Im m_0(z)$ over a grid of values $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ with $\Im z = 0.001$, where $m_0(z)$ is computed using the iterative procedure of Theorem 1.3.

2.2. **Balanced nested classification.** We consider the generalization of (9) to fully nested multi-way classification designs; for simplicity we assume the balanced case. $\{Y_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} \in \mathbb{R}^p : 1 \le j_1 \le J_1, \ldots, 1 \le j_k \le J_k\}$ are observations of a p-dimensional response across $n = J_1 J_2 \ldots J_k$ independent samples. The samples are divided into $J_1 \ge 2$ groups of equal size $J_2 \ldots J_k$, the samples within each group are further divided into $J_2 \ge 2$ subgroups of equal size $J_3 \ldots J_k$, etc., and there are $J_k \ge 2$ samples in each subgroup at the finest level of division. The data are modeled as

$$Y_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} = \mu + \alpha^{(1)}_{j_1} + \alpha^{(2)}_{j_1,j_2} + \ldots + \alpha^{(k-1)}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{k-1}} + \varepsilon_{j_1,\ldots,j_k}, \tag{11}$$

where $Y_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the observed values for the j_k^{th} sample in subgroup $(j_1, \ldots, j_{k-1})$; $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the population mean values; $\alpha^{(r)}_{j_1,\ldots,j_r} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_r)$ are random group and subgroup effects for the various factors of the classification; and $\varepsilon_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_k)$ are residual errors. The case $k = 2$ is the one-way design of Section 2.1. The two-way setting ($k = 3$) is the model for the full-sib half-sib design or North Carolina Design I [CR48], in which each group corresponds to offspring of a single male and each subgroup corresponds to (multiple) offspring from a single female mated to this male. It is also the model for the monozygotic-twin half-sib design [NC76], in which each group corresponds to offspring of a twin pair and has two subgroups, each subgroup corresponding to offspring of one twin in the pair [LW98].

Defining the sum-of-squares SS_r for each level $r = 1, \ldots, k$ in a manner analogous to Section 2.1 and detailed in Appendix A, and letting $SS_{k+1} := 0$ for notational convenience, the standard MANOVA estimators are given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_r = \frac{1}{J_{r+1} \ldots J_k} \left(\frac{SS_r}{J_1 \ldots J_{r-1}(J_r - 1)} - \frac{SS_{r+1}}{J_1 \ldots J_r (J_{r+1} - 1)} \right) \quad \forall r = 1, \ldots, k. \tag{12}$$

Theorem 1.2 yields the following corollary:

Corollary 2.2. *Fix $J_2, \ldots, J_k \ge 2$, let $n = J_1 J_2 \ldots J_k$, and assume $p, n, J_1 \to \infty$ such that $c < p/n < C$ and $\|\Sigma_r\| < C$ for all $r = 1, \ldots, k$ and some $C, c > 0$. Then for any $r \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$,*



FIGURE 1. Simulated eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ for the balanced one-way layout model with $J_1 = \ldots = J_I = 4$, $n = 1600$, $I = 400$, $p = 500$, and (a) $\Sigma_1 = 0$, $\Sigma_2 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, (b) $\Sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_2 = 0.5\,\mathrm{Id}_p$, (c) $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, and (d) $\Sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_2 = 2\,\mathrm{Id}_p$. Theoretical predictions of Corollary 2.1 are overlaid in black.

$\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_r} - \mu_0 \to 0$ *weakly a.s. for* μ_0 *having Stieltjes transform* $m_0(z)$ *determined by*

$$a_s(z) = -\frac{1}{J_1 \ldots J_s} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\,\mathrm{Id} + \sum_{j=r}^{k} b_j(z)\Sigma_j\right)^{-1} \Sigma_s\right) \quad \forall s = r, \ldots, k,$$

$$b_r(z) = -\frac{J_r - 1}{J_r - 1 + J_r \sum_{j=r}^{k} a_j(z)},$$

$$b_s(z) = -\frac{1}{J_{r+1} \ldots J_s}\left(\frac{J_r - 1}{J_r - 1 + J_r \sum_{j=r}^{k} a_j(z)} - \frac{J_{r+1} - 1}{J_{r+1} - 1 - \sum_{j=r+1}^{k} a_j(z)}\right) \quad \forall s = r+1, \ldots, k,$$

$$m_0(z) = -\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\,\mathrm{Id} + \sum_{j=r}^{k} b_j(z)\Sigma_j\right)^{-1}\right).$$

For the first variance component $r = 1$, the result holds also if we replace all appearances of the quantity $(J_1 - 1)/(J_1 - 1 + J_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j(z))$ by $1/(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j(z))$.

2.3. **Replicated crossed two-way classification.** $\{Y_{i,j,k,l} \in \mathbb{R}^p : 1 \le i \le I, 1 \le j \le J, 1 \le k \le K, 1 \le l \le L\}$ represent observations across $n = IJKL$ independent samples. The samples belong to I replicated experiments of a $J \times K$ crossed design with fixed numbers J and K of levels for two factors, and with L samples in each replicate i corresponding to each level cross $j \times k$. The data are modeled as

$$Y_{i,j,k,l} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_{i,j} + \gamma_{i,k} + \delta_{i,j,k} + \varepsilon_{i,j,k,l}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the population mean values, $\alpha_i \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_1)$ are random replicate effects, $\beta_{i,j} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_2)$ and $\gamma_{i,k} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_3)$ are random effects for the two factors, $\delta_{i,j,k} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_4)$ are random effects for the interaction between the factors, and $\varepsilon_{i,j,k,l} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_5)$ are residual errors. This crossed $J \times K$ design corresponds to the Comstock-Robinson model or North Carolina Design II commonly used in plant studies [CR48], in which each of J males is mated to each of K females. We place this model in a replicated setting as, typically in practice, J and K are not large, and the sample size is increased by taking many independent $J \times K$ blocks [LW98, pp. 601–603].

Defining sums-of-squares $SS_1, SS_2, SS_3, SS_4, SS_5$ as described in Appendix A, the standard MANOVA estimators are given [SCM09, Chapter 4.3] by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Sigma}_1 &= \frac{1}{JKL}\left(\frac{SS_1}{I-1} - \frac{SS_2}{I(J-1)} - \frac{SS_3}{I(K-1)} + \frac{SS_4}{I(J-1)(K-1)}\right), \\
\hat{\Sigma}_2 &= \frac{1}{KL}\left(\frac{SS_2}{I(J-1)} - \frac{SS_4}{I(J-1)(K-1)}\right), \\
\hat{\Sigma}_3 &= \frac{1}{JL}\left(\frac{SS_3}{I(K-1)} - \frac{SS_4}{I(J-1)(K-1)}\right), \\
\hat{\Sigma}_4 &= \frac{1}{L}\left(\frac{SS_4}{I(J-1)(K-1)} - \frac{SS_5}{IJK(L-1)}\right), \\
\hat{\Sigma}_5 &= \frac{SS_5}{IJK(L-1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Theorem 1.2 yields the following corollary:

Corollary 2.3. *Fix $J, K, L \ge 2$, let $n = IJKL$, and assume $p, n, I \to \infty$ such that $c < p/n < C$ and $\|\Sigma_r\| \le C$ for each $r = 1, \dots, 5$ and some $C, c > 0$. Denote $I_1 = I$, $I_2 = IJ$, $I_3 = IK$, $I_4 = IJK$, and $I_5 = n$. Then:*

(a) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_1} - \mu_0 \to 0$ weakly a.s., for μ_0 having Stieltjes transform $m_0(z)$ determined by

$$\begin{aligned}
a_s(z) &= -\frac{1}{I_s}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\,\mathrm{Id} + \sum_{j=1}^{5} b_j(z)\Sigma_j\right)^{-1}\Sigma_s\right) \quad \forall s = 1,2,3,4,5, \\
b_1(z) &= -\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{5} a_j(z)}, \\
b_2(z) &= -\frac{1}{J}\left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{5} a_j(z)} - \frac{J-1}{J - 1 - a_2(z) - a_4(z) - a_5(z)}\right), \\
b_3(z) &= -\frac{1}{K}\left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{5} a_j(z)} - \frac{K-1}{K - 1 - a_3(z) - a_4(z) - a_5(z)}\right), \\
b_4(z) &= -\frac{1}{JK}\left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{5} a_j(z)} - \frac{J-1}{J - 1 - a_2(z) - a_4(z) - a_5(z)}\right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{K-1}{K-1-a_3(z)-a_4(z)-a_5(z)}+\frac{(J-1)(K-1)}{(J-1)(K-1)+a_4(z)+a_5(z)}\Bigg),$$

$$b_5(z)=\frac{1}{L}b_4(z),$$

$$m_0(z)=-\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+\sum_{j=1}^{5}b_j(z)\Sigma_j\right)^{-1}\right).$$

(b) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_2}-\mu_0\to 0$ *weakly a.s., for* μ_0 *having Stieltjes transform* $m_0(z)$ *determined by*

$$a_s(z)=-\frac{1}{I_s}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_2(z)\Sigma_2+b_4(z)\Sigma_4+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\Sigma_s\right)\quad\forall s=2,4,5,$$

$$b_2(z)=-\frac{J-1}{J-1+J(a_2(z)+a_4(z)+a_5(z))},$$

$$b_4(z)=-\frac{1}{K}\left(\frac{J-1}{J-1+J(a_2(z)+a_4(z)+a_5(z))}-\frac{(J-1)(K-1)}{(J-1)(K-1)-J(a_4(z)+a_5(z))}\right),$$

$$b_5(z)=\frac{1}{L}b_4(z),$$

$$m_0(z)=-\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_2(z)\Sigma_2+b_4(z)\Sigma_4+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\right).$$

(c) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_4}-\mu_0\to 0$ *weakly a.s., for* μ_0 *having Stieltjes transform* $m_0(z)$ *determined by*

$$a_s(z)=-\frac{1}{I_s}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_4(z)\Sigma_4+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\Sigma_s\right)\quad\forall s=4,5,$$

$$b_4(z)=-\frac{(J-1)(K-1)}{(J-1)(K-1)+JK(a_4(z)+a_5(z))},$$

$$b_5(z)=-\frac{1}{L}\left(\frac{(J-1)(K-1)}{(J-1)(K-1)+JK(a_4(z)+a_5(z))}-\frac{L-1}{L-1-a_5(z)}\right),$$

$$m_0(z)=-\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_4(z)\Sigma_4+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\right).$$

(d) $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_5}-\mu_0\to 0$ *weakly a.s., for* μ_0 *having Stieltjes transform* $m_0(z)$ *determined by*

$$a_5(z)=-\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\Sigma_5\right),\quad b_5(z)=-\frac{L-1}{L-1+La_5(z)},$$

$$m_0(z)=-\frac{1}{p}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}+b_5(z)\Sigma_5\right)^{-1}\right).$$

(The result for $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_3}$ is the same as for $\mu_{\hat{\Sigma}_2}$ upon relabeling the two factors.)

3. Free deterministic equivalents for orthogonally-invariant matrices

3.1. **Free probability definitions.** We briefly review the framework of operator-valued free probability theory and its application to rectangular random matrices, developed in [VDN92, Voi95, BG09].

Definition 3.1. A **non-commutative probability space** $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ is a $*$-algebra[†] $\mathcal{A}$ over $\mathbb{C}$ and a $*$-linear functional $\tau:\mathcal{A}\to\mathbb{C}$ called the **trace** that satisfies, for all $a,b\in\mathcal{A}$ and for $1_{\mathcal{A}}\in\mathcal{A}$ the multiplicative unit,

$$\tau(1_{\mathcal{A}})=1,\quad\tau(ab)=\tau(ba).$$

[†]By $*$-algebra, we mean a unital associative algebra equipped with a conjugate-linear involution $*:\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}$. The multiplication operation in $\mathcal{A}$ is, in general, not commutative.

Following [BG09], we will handle rectangular matrices by embedding them into larger square matrices. The following definition captures the structure for such embeddings.

Definition 3.2. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a non-commutative probability space and $d \geq 1$ a positive integer. For $p_1, \ldots, p_d \in \mathcal{A}$, $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$ is a **rectangular probability space** if $p_1, \ldots, p_d$ are non-zero pairwise-orthogonal projections summing to 1, i.e. for all $r \neq s \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$,

$$p_r \neq 0, \;\; p_r = p_r^* = p_r^2, \;\; p_r p_s = 0, \;\; p_1 + \ldots + p_d = 1.$$

An element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is **simple** if $p_r a p_s = a$ for some $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ (possibly $r = s$).

Example 3.3. Let $N_1, \ldots, N_d \geq 1$ be positive integers and denote $N = N_1 + \ldots + N_d$. Consider the $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$, with the involution $*$ given by the adjoint (i.e. conjugate transpose) map $A \mapsto A^*$. For $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$, let $\tau(A) = N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} A$. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \tau) = (\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr})$ is a non-commutative probability space. Any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ may be written in block form as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \cdots & A_{1d} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \cdots & A_{2d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{d1} & A_{d2} & \cdots & A_{dd} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_{st} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_s \times N_t}$. For each $r = 1, \ldots, d$, denote by P_r the matrix with (r, r) block equal to Id_{N_r} and (s, t) block equal to 0 for all other s, t. Then P_r is a projection, and $(\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}, P_1, \ldots, P_d)$ is a rectangular probability space. $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is simple if $A_{st} \neq 0$ for at most one block (s, t).

In a rectangular probability space, the projections $p_1, \ldots, p_d$ generate a sub-$*$-algebra

$$\mathcal{D} := \langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle = \left\{ \sum_{r=1}^{d} z_r p_r : z_r \in \mathbb{C} \right\}. \tag{15}$$

We may define a $*$-linear map $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$ by

$$\mathbf{F}(a) = \sum_{r=1}^{d} p_r \tau(p_r)^{-1} \tau(p_r a p_r), \tag{16}$$

which is a projection onto $\mathcal{D}$ in the sense $\mathbf{F}(d) = d$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$. In Example 3.3, $\mathcal{D}$ consists of matrices $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ for which A_{rr} is a multiple of the identity for each r and $A_{rs} = 0$ for each $r \neq s$, and $\mathbf{F}(A)$ encodes the trace of each diagonal block A_{rr}. The algebraic structure of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{F})$ is captured by the following definition of an operator-valued probability space.

Definition 3.4. A **$\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space** $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ is a $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a sub-$*$-algebra $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ containing the unit $1_{\mathcal{A}}$, and a $*$-linear map $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ called the **conditional expectation** satisfying, for all $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(bab') = b\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a)b', \;\; \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(b) = b.$$

We identify $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$ as a sub-algebra via the inclusion map $z \mapsto z1_{\mathcal{A}}$, and we write 1 for $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ and z for $z1_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then a non-commutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ is also a $\mathbb{C}$-valued probability space with $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} = \tau$. It is easily verified that $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$ defined by (16) satisfies the conditions of Definition 3.4, and furthermore that $\mathbf{F}$ is τ-invariant in the following sense:

Definition 3.5. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a non-commutative probability space, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ a sub-algebra containing the unit $1_{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ a conditional expectation. $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ is **τ-invariant** if $\tau \circ \mathbf{F}^{B} = \tau$.

In a non-commutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ may be thought of as a non-commutative analogue of a bounded random variable, $\tau(a)$ as the analogue of its expectation, and $\mathbf{F}(a)$ as the analogue of its conditional expectation with respect to a sub-sigma-field. The following definitions then provide an analogue of the conditional distribution of a:

Definition 3.6. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a $*$-algebra and $\mathcal{I}$ be any set. A **monomial** in the variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{B}$ is an expression of the form $b_1y_1b_2y_2\dots b_{l-1}y_{l-1}b_l$ where $l \geq 1$, $b_1, \dots, b_l \in \mathcal{B}$, and $y_1, \dots, y_{l-1} \in \{x_i, x_i^* : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$. A **polynomial** in $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{B}$ is any finite sum of such monomials.

Definition 3.7. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space, let $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be elements of $\mathcal{A}$, and let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all polynomials in variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{B}$. The (joint) **$\mathcal{B}$-law**, or $\mathcal{B}$-distribution, of $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ is the collection of values in $\mathcal{B}$

$$\left(\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(P(a_i, a_i^*)_{i\in I})\right)_{P\in\mathcal{P}}. \tag{17}$$

In the scalar setting where $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} = \tau$, a monomial takes the simpler form $zy_1y_2\dots y_{l-1}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $y_1, \dots, y_{l-1} \in (x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ (because $\mathbb{C}$ commutes with $\mathcal{A}$), and the collection of values (17) is determined by the scalar-valued moments $(\tau(w(a_i, a_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}))_{w\in\mathcal{W}}$ where $\mathcal{W}$ contains all words in the letters $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$. This is the analogue of the unconditional joint distribution of a family of bounded random variables, as specified by all of their joint moments.

Finally, the following definition of operator-valued freeness, introduced in [Voi95], has similarities to the notion of conditional independence of sub-sigma-fields in the classical setting.

Definition 3.8. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space and $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ a collection of sub-$*$-algebras of $\mathcal{A}$ which contain $\mathcal{B}$. $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ are **$\mathcal{B}$-free**, or free with amalgamation over $\mathcal{B}$, if for all $m \geq 1$, for all $i_1, \dots, i_m \in \mathcal{I}$ with $i_1 \neq i_2$, $i_2 \neq i_3$, …, $i_{m-1} \neq i_m$, and for all $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1}, \dots, a_m \in \mathcal{A}_{i_m}$, the following implication holds:

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1) = \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a_2) = \dots = \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a_m) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1a_2\dots a_m) = 0.$$

A collection of subsets $(S_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ are **$\mathcal{B}$-free** if the collection of sub-$*$-algebras $(\langle S_i, \mathcal{B}\rangle)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ are.

In the classical setting, the joint law of (conditionally) independent random variables is determined by their marginal (conditional) laws. A similar statement holds for freeness:

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ is a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space, and subsets $(S_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ are $\mathcal{B}$-free. Then the $\mathcal{B}$-law of $\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} S_i$ is determined by the individual $\mathcal{B}$-laws of the S_i's.*

Proof. See [Voi95, Proposition 1.3]. □

3.2. **Asymptotic approximations using free deterministic equivalents.** The concept of a free deterministic equivalent model was introduced in [SV12] for specific examples of random matrices. Here, we formalize this definition for independent jointly orthogonally-invariant families of matrices, and we establish closeness of the random matrices and the free model in this general setting.

Definition 3.10. For fixed $d \geq 1$, consider two sequences, indexed by $N \geq 1$, of N-dependent, non-commutative rectangular probability spaces $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \dots, p_d)$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_d)$ such that for each $r \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, as $N \to \infty$,

$$|\tau(p_r) - \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{p}_r)| \to 0.$$

For a common index set $\mathcal{I}$, consider elements $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $(\tilde{a}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of $\tilde{A}$. Then $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ and $(\tilde{a}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ are **asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law** if the following holds: For any polynomial P in the variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_d\rangle$, denoting by $\tilde{P}$ the corresponding polynomial with coefficients in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \langle \tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_d\rangle$, as $N \to \infty$,

$$|\tau(P(a_i, a_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}) - \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{P}(\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{a}_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}})| \to 0. \tag{18}$$

If $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ and/or $(\tilde{a}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ are random elements of $\mathcal{A}$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, then they are **asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s.** if the above holds almost surely for each individual polynomial P.

Remark 3.11. The condition (18) holds for all polynomials P with coefficients in $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if it holds for $p_r(Q(a_i, a_i^*)_{i\in\mathcal{I}})p_r$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, d$ and all polynomials Q with coefficients in $\mathcal{D}$. Hence, comparing with (16) and Definition 3.7, asymptotic equality in $\mathcal{D}$-law is stating that "the difference between the $\mathcal{D}$-law of $(a_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ and the $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$-law of $(\tilde{a}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ converges pointwise (over all polynomials P) to 0".

We will apply Definition 3.10 by taking one of the two rectangular probability spaces to be a matrix space as in Example 3.3, containing random elements, and the other to be an approximating deterministic model. (We will use the word "distribution" for random matrices to mean their distribution as random elements of $\mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ in the usual probabilistic sense, reserving the term "$\mathcal{B}$-law" to refer to the concept in Definition 3.7.) Freeness relations in the deterministic model will emerge from the following notion of rotational invariance of the random matrices.

Definition 3.12. Consider the rectangular probability space $(\mathbb{C}^{N\times N}, N^{-1}\operatorname{Tr}, P_1, \ldots, P_d)$ of Example 3.3. A finite family of complex random matrices $(H_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ is **rectangularly orthogonally invariant** if, for any real orthogonal matrices $O_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1\times N_1}, \ldots, O_d \in \mathbb{R}^{N_d\times N_d}$, denoting $O = \operatorname{diag}(O_1, \ldots, O_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$, the joint distribution of $(H_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ is equal to that of $(O^T H_i O)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$.

We provide several examples of Definitions 3.10 and 3.12:

Example 3.13. Consider the matrix space of Example 3.3. Fix $r \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and let $G \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ be a simple random matrix such that the diagonal block $G_{rr} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_r\times N_r}$ is distributed either as the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble or the Gaussian Orthogonal Ensemble, scaled so that off-diagonal entries of G_{rr} have variance $1/N_r$ (and $G_{st} = 0$ for all other blocks (s,t)). Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$ be a rectangular probability space with $\tau(p_s) = N_s/N$ for each $s = 1, \ldots, d$, such that $\mathcal{A}$ contains a self-adjoint simple element g satisfying $g = g^*$ and $p_r g p_r = g$, with moments given by the semi-circle law:

$$\tau(g^l) = \frac{N_r}{N}\int_{-2}^{2} \frac{x^l}{2\pi}\sqrt{4-x^2}dx \ \ \forall l \geq 1.$$

Then (the single-element families) G and g are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s., and G is rectangularly orthogonally invariant.

Example 3.14. Consider the matrix space of Example 3.3. Fix $r_1 \neq r_2 \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and let $G \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ be a simple random matrix such that $G_{r_1 r_2} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_1}\times N_{r_2}}$ has i.i.d. Gaussian or complex Gaussian entries with variance $1/N_{r_1}$ (and $G_{st} = 0$ for all other s, t). Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$ be a rectangular probability space with $\tau(p_s) = N_s/N$ for each $s = 1, \ldots, d$, such that $\mathcal{A}$ contains a simple element g satisfying $p_{r_1} g p_{r_2} = g$, where g^*g has moments given by the Marcenko-Pastur law:

$$\tau((g^*g)^l) = \frac{N_{r_2}}{N}\int x^l \nu^{(MP)}_{N_{r_2}/N_{r_1}}(x)dx \ \ \forall l \geq 1$$

where $\nu^{(MP)}_\lambda$ is the standard Marcenko-Pastur density

$$\nu^{(MP)}_\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\sqrt{(\lambda_+ - x)(x-\lambda_-)}}{\lambda x}\mathbb{1}_{[\lambda_-,\lambda_+]}(x), \tag{19}$$

$$\lambda_+ = (1+\sqrt{\lambda})^2, \ \lambda_- = (1-\sqrt{\lambda})^2.$$

Then (the single-element families) G and g are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s., and G is rectangularly orthogonally invariant.

Example 3.15. Consider the matrix space of Example 3.3. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ be any deterministic simple matrices, say with $P_{r_i} B_i P_{s_i} = B_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and some $r_i, s_i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. Let $O_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1\times N_1}, \ldots, O_d \in \mathbb{R}^{N_d\times N_d}$ be independent Haar-distributed orthogonal matrices, define $O = \operatorname{diag}(O_1, \ldots, O_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$, and let $\tilde{B}_i = O^T B_i O$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$

be a rectangular probability space with $\tau(p_s) = N_s/N$ for each $s = 1, \ldots, d$, such that $\mathcal{A}$ contains simple elements $b_1, \ldots, b_k$ satisfying $p_{r_i} b_i p_{s_i} = b_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, and

$$N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} P(B_1, B_1^*, \ldots, B_k, B_k^*) = \tau(\tilde{P}(b_1, b_1^*, \ldots, b_k, b_k^*)) \tag{20}$$

for any non-commutative polynomial $P = \tilde{P}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$. As $\operatorname{Tr} P(B_1, B_1^*, \ldots, B_k, B_k^*)$ is invariant under the transformations $B_i \mapsto O^T B_i O$ for $O = \operatorname{diag}(O_1, \ldots, O_d)$ and any polynomial P, (20) holds with $\tilde{B}_i$ in place of B_i. Also, (20) holds for any polynomial P with coefficients in $\mathcal{D} = \langle P_1, \ldots, P_d \rangle$ and the corresponding polynomial $\tilde{P}$ with coefficients in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle$, as the projections P_r and p_r may be absorbed into the simple elements $\tilde{B}_i$ and b_i. Hence $(\tilde{B}_i)_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}}$ and $(b_i)_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}}$ are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s., and $(\tilde{B}_i)_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}}$ is rectangularly orthogonally invariant by construction.

To study random matrix models involving matrices from several independent and rectangularly orthogonally invariant families, we will take a deterministic model for each family, as in Examples 3.13, 3.14, and 3.15 above, and consider a combined model in which these families are $\mathcal{D}$-free in the sense of Definition 3.8:

Definition 3.16. Consider the rectangular probability space $(\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}, P_1, \ldots, P_d)$ of Example 3.3. Suppose $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ are finite families of random matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ such that:

- These families are independent from each other, and
- For each $j = 1, \ldots, J$, $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ is rectangularly orthogonally invariant.

Then a **free deterministic equivalent** for $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ is any (possibly N-dependent) rectangular probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$ and families $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ of deterministic elements in $\mathcal{A}$ such that, as $N \to \infty$:

- For each $r = 1, \ldots, d$, $|N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} P_r - \tau(p_r)| \to 0$,
- For each $j = 1, \ldots, J$, $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ and $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j}$ are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s., and
- $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ are free with amalgamation over $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle$.

The main result of this section is the following theorem, which establishes asymptotic equality in $\mathcal{D}$-law of the free deterministic equivalent to the original matrix model. The proof is contained in Appendix B.

Theorem 3.17. *In the rectangular probability space $(\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}, P_1, \ldots, P_d)$ of Example 3.3, suppose $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ are independent, rectangularly orthogonally invariant families of random matrices, and let $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_J}$ be any free deterministic equivalent in a rectangular probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$. If there exist constants $C, c > 0$ (independent of N) such that*

- *$c < N_r/N < C$ for all $r = 1, \ldots, d$, and*
- *$\sup_{j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}} \sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} \|H_i\| \leq C$ for all large N a.s.,*

then $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}$ and $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}$ are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s.

Theorem 3.17 is inspired by and similar to [BG09, Theorem 1.6] and [SV12, Theorem 2.7]. It extends these results in several ways:

- In contrast to [BG09, Theorem 1.6], we permit multiple independent families of jointly orthogonally-invariant matrices (where the matrices within each family are not independent), as is the case in our application with $\{\tilde{H}_r : r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\{\tilde{B}_{r,s} : r, s = 1, \ldots, k\}$.
- In contrast to [SV12, Theorem 2.7], we use the matrix trace $N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}$ and the almost-sure asymptotic freeness approach (see e.g. [HP00, Col03]), rather than the expected trace $\mathbb{E} \circ N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}$. Hence our result holds in the almost-sure sense rather than only in mean.

- We weaken the assumption of unitary invariance to orthogonal invariance, and our proof extends combinatorial arguments of [HP00] that handle Haar unitary matrices to the orthogonal case.
- We do not require each random matrix family to converge in joint law, but instead only that each family be well-approximated in joint law by a corresponding N-dependent model. Hence Theorem 3.17 fully embraces the deterministic equivalents approach.

3.3. **Computational tools.** Our computations in the free model will use the tools of operator-valued free cumulants, $\mathcal{R}$-transforms, and Cauchy transforms developed in [Spe98, NSS02, SV12]. We review the relevant concepts here.

Definition 3.18. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space, let $l \geq 1$, and let $NC(l)$ denote the set of all non-crossing partitions of $\{1, \ldots, l\}$. The **free cumulant functions** of $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ are the (unique) multi-linear maps $\kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A}^l \to \mathcal{B}$, indexed by $\pi \in \bigcup_{l \geq 1} NC(l)$, satisfying the moment-cumulant relations

$$\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1 a_2 \ldots a_l) = \sum_{\pi \in NC(l)} \kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1, \ldots, a_l)$$

for all $l \geq 1$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_l \in \mathcal{A}$. For the partition $\pi = \{\{1, \ldots, l\}\}$ consisting of a single set, we denote $\kappa_l := \kappa_\pi$.

The free cumulant functions are multiplicative functions, in the sense

$$\kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}}(ba_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{l-1}, a_l b') = b\kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1, \ldots, a_l)b', \tag{21}$$

$$\kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1, \ldots, a_{j-1}, a_j b, a_{j+1}, \ldots, a_l) = \kappa_\pi^{\mathcal{B}}(a_1, \ldots, a_j, ba_{j+1}, a_{j+2}, \ldots, a_l), \tag{22}$$

for any $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_l \in \mathcal{A}$. (See [NSS02, Section 2] or [SV12, Section 2].)

Definition 3.19. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the ***$\mathcal{B}$*-valued $\mathcal{R}$-transform** of a is defined, for $b \in \mathcal{B}$, as

$$\mathcal{R}_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b) := \sum_{l \geq 1} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{B}}(ab, \ldots, ab, a). \tag{23}$$

Definition 3.20. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the ***$\mathcal{B}$*-valued Cauchy transform** of a is defined, for invertible $b \in \mathcal{B}$, as

$$G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b) := \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}((b-a)^{-1}) = \sum_{l \geq 0} \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(b^{-1}(ab^{-1})^l). \tag{24}$$

Equations (23) and (24) are always well-defined as formal series in b^{-1} and b. In our application, we will construct the free deterministic equivalent model $\mathcal{A}$ as a von Neumann algebra, equipped with a Banach norm $\|\cdot\|$, with τ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ norm-continuous. Then (23) and (24) are also well-defined as convergent series when $\|b\|$ and $\|b^{-1}\|$ are sufficiently small, respectively, with the second equality of (24) holding as an identity in $\mathcal{B}$.

$G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b)$ and $\mathcal{R}_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b) + b^{-1}$ are inverses with respect to composition, a result which we may write in the following forms:

Proposition 3.21. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}})$ be a $\mathcal{B}$-valued probability space. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and invertible $b \in \mathcal{B}$,*

$$G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b^{-1} + \mathcal{R}_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b)) = b, \tag{25}$$

$$G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b) = \left(b - \mathcal{R}_a^{\mathcal{B}}(G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(b))\right)^{-1}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. See [Voi95, Theorem 4.9] and also [Spe98, Theorem 4.1.12]. □

The equalities (25) and (26) hold as formal series, and also as identities in $\mathcal{B}$ in the normed setting for sufficiently small $\|b\|$ and $\|b^{-1}\|$, respectively.

Our computation will pass between cumulant functions, $\mathcal{R}$-transforms, and Cauchy transforms with respect to various nested sub-algebras of $\mathcal{A}$. Central to this approach is the following result from [NSS02] (see also [SV12]):

Proposition 3.22. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{F})$ be a $\mathcal{D}$-valued probability space, let $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be sub-$*$-algebras containing $\mathcal{D}$, and let $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a conditional expectation such that $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{F}^{B} = \mathbf{F}$. Suppose $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies the faithfulness condition that if $\mathbf{F}(b_1 b_2) = 0$ for all $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and some $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}$, then $b_1 = 0$. Let $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A}^l \to \mathcal{B}$ denote the non-crossing cumulants for $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{A}^l \to \mathcal{D}$ denote those for $\mathbf{F}$. Then $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are $\mathcal{D}$-free if and only if for all $l \geq 1$, $h_1, \ldots, h_l \in \mathcal{H}$, and $b_1, \ldots, b_{l-1} \in \mathcal{B}$,*

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{B}}(h_1 b_1, \ldots, h_{l-1} b_{l-1}, h_l) = \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(h_1 \mathbf{F}(b_1), \ldots, h_{l-1}\mathbf{F}(b_{l-1}), h_l).$$

Proof. See [NSS02, Theorem 3.6]. □

For sub-algebras $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and conditional expectations $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} = \mathbf{F}$, we also have for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and invertible $d \in \mathcal{D}$, by (24),

$$G_a^{\mathcal{D}}(d) = \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{D}} \circ G_a^{\mathcal{B}}(d). \tag{27}$$

Finally, note that for $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} = \tau$, $G_a^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ is the scalar-valued Cauchy transform

$$G_a^{\mathbb{C}}(z) = \tau((z-a)^{-1}) = \sum_{l \geq 0} z^{-(l+1)} \tau(a^l). \tag{28}$$

The Stieltjes transform of $a \in \mathcal{A}$ may then be defined as $m_a(z) = -G_a^{\mathbb{C}}(z) = \tau((a-z)^{-1})$. We will apply Theorem 3.17 in the form of the following corollary (whose proof is deferred to Appendix B), which verifies that if $w \in \mathcal{A}$ is a free deterministic equivalent for W in a matrix space, then $m_w(z)$ well-approximates the matrix Stieltjes transform $m_W(z)$.

Corollary 3.23. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.17, fix a self-adjoint polynomial P (with complex coefficients) in $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}$, and let*

$$W = P((H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, \quad w = P((h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Suppose there exists $C > 0$ such that $|\tau(w^l)| \leq C^l$ for all N and all $l \geq 0$. Define the Stieltjes transforms $m_W(z) := N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}(W - z \operatorname{Id}_{N \times N})^{-1}$ and $m_w(z) := -G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$. Then for a sufficiently large constant $C_0 > 0$, letting $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : |z| > C_0\}$, $G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ is well-defined by the right side of (28) as a convergent series for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and pointwise almost surely over $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$m_W(z) - m_w(z) \to 0.$$

4. Proof of main result

We will prove the following more general form of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Theorem 4.1. *Fix $k \geq 1$. Let $B \in \mathbb{C}^{(n_1+\ldots+n_k)\times(n_1+\ldots+n_k)}$ be a deterministic matrix such that $B = B^*$, and let $B_{r,s} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_r \times n_s}$ denote the (r,s) submatrix of B. For $r = 1, \ldots, k$, let $H_r \in \mathbb{C}^{m_r \times p}$ be deterministic matrices, and let G_r be independent random matrices such that either $G_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times m_r}$ with $(G_r)_{ij} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, n_r^{-1})$ or $G_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n_r \times m_r}$ with $\Im(G_r)_{ij}, \Re(G_r)_{ij} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, (2n_r)^{-1})$. Define*

$$W := \sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} H_r^* G_r^* B_{r,s} G_s H_s \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}, \tag{29}$$

and denote by μ_W its empirical spectral measure. Let $p, n_1, \ldots, n_k, m_1, \ldots, m_k \to \infty$, such that $c < n_r/p < C$, $c < m_r/p < C$, $\|H_r\| < C$, and $\|B_{r,s}\| < C$ for all $r, s = 1, \ldots, k$ and some constants $C, c > 0$. Then:

(a) For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, there exist unique values $a_1(z), \ldots, a_k(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$ and $b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ that satisfy, for $r = 1, \ldots, k$, the equations

$$a_r(z) = -\frac{1}{n_r} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_s(z) H_s^* H_s \right)^{-1} H_r^* H_r \right), \tag{30}$$

$$b_r(z) = -\frac{1}{n_r} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\operatorname{Id}_{n_1+\ldots+n_k} + BD\left(a_1(z), \ldots, a_k(z)\right) \right)^{-1} B \right)_{r,r}, \tag{31}$$

where $D(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ and the notation $\operatorname{Tr}(A)_{r,r}$ are as in Theorem 1.2(a).

(b) Let

$$m_0(z) := -\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_s(z) H_s^* H_s \right)^{-1} \right). \tag{32}$$

Then $m_0 : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \mathbb{C}^+$ defines the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure μ_0 on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu_W - \mu_0 \to 0$ weakly almost surely.

(c) For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $a_1(z), \ldots, a_k(z), b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z)$ in (a) are the limits, as $t \to \infty$, of $a_r^{(t)}$ and $b_r^{(t)}$ computed by iterating (30) and (31) in the manner of Theorem 1.3.

Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 follow by specializing this result to $m_1 = \ldots = m_r = p$, $n_r = I_r$ and $H_r = \Sigma_r^{1/2}$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, k$, and $B = M$ where M is as in Theorem 1.2(a).

To prove Theorem 4.1, introduce Haar-distributed orthogonal matrices $O_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $O_r \in \mathbb{R}^{m_r \times m_r}$, and $O_{k+r} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_r}$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, k$, independent of each other and of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Consider the transformations

$$H_r \mapsto O_r^T H_r O_0, \quad B_{r,s} \mapsto O_{k+r}^T B_{r,s} O_{k+s}.$$

As in Section 1.2, the empirical spectral distribution of W remains invariant in law under these transformations. Furthermore, the right sides of (30–32) also remain invariant under these transformations. Hence it suffices to prove Theorem 4.1 with H_r and $B_{r,s}$ replaced by these randomly-rotated matrices, which (with a slight abuse of notation) we continue to denote by H_r and $B_{r,s}$.

Let $N = p + m_1 + \ldots + m_k + n_1 + \ldots + n_k$, and embed the matrices $W, H_r, G_r, B_{r,s}$ as simple elements of $\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ in the following regions of the block-matrix decomposition corresponding to $\mathbb{C}^N = \mathbb{C}^p \oplus \mathbb{C}^{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}^{m_k} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}^{n_k}$:

W	H_1^*	$\cdots$	H_k^*			
H_1				G_1^*		
$\vdots$					$\ddots$	
H_k						G_k^*
	G_1			$B_{1,1}$	$\cdots$	$B_{1,k}$
		$\ddots$		$\vdots$	$\ddots$	$\vdots$
			G_k	$B_{k,1}$	$\cdots$	$B_{k,k}$

Denote by $P_0, \ldots, P_{2k}$ the projection matrices corresponding to the above block decomposition, and by $\tilde{W} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ the embedding of W, etc. (So $P_0 = \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{Id}_p, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $\tilde{W} = \operatorname{diag}(W, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $P_1 = \operatorname{diag}(0, \operatorname{Id}_{m_1}, 0, \ldots, 0)$, etc.) Then $\tilde{W}, \tilde{H}_r, \tilde{G}_r, \tilde{B}_{r,s}$ are (random) simple elements of the rectangular probability space $(\mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}, P_0, \ldots, P_{2k})$. Furthermore, the families of random matrices $\{\tilde{H}_r\}, \{\tilde{B}_{r,s}\}, \tilde{G}_1, \ldots, \tilde{G}_k$ are independent and rectangularly orthogonally invariant.

Consider a second rectangular probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ with deterministic elements $h_r, g_r, b_{rs} \in \mathcal{A}$, such that the following hold:

1. $p_0, \ldots, p_{2k}$ have traces

$$\tau(p_0) = \frac{p}{N}, \ \tau(p_r) = \frac{m_r}{N}, \ \tau(p_{k+r}) = \frac{n_r}{N} \quad \forall r = 1, \ldots, k.$$

2. h_r, g_r, b_{rs} are simple elements such that for all $r, s = 1, \ldots, k$,
$$p_r h_r p_0 = h_r, \;\; p_{k+r} g_r p_r = g_r, \;\; p_{k+r} b_{rs} p_{k+s} = b_{rs}.$$
3. $(h_r)_{r\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}$ has the same joint law as $(\tilde{H}_r)_{r\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}$, and $(b_{rs})_{r,s\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}$ has the same joint law as $(\tilde{B}_{r,s})_{r,s\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}$. I.e., for any non-commutative polynomials P and Q with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$,
$$\tau\left(P\left((h_r, h_r^*)_{r\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{Tr} P\left((\tilde{H}_r, \tilde{H}_r^*)_{r\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}\right), \tag{33}$$
$$\tau\left(Q\left((b_{rs}, b_{rs}^*)_{r,s\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{Tr} Q\left((\tilde{B}_{r,s}, \tilde{B}_{r,s}^*)_{r,s\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}\right). \tag{34}$$
4. $g_1, \ldots, g_k$ are such that $g_r^* g_r$ has Marcenko-Pastur law with parameter m_r/n_r, i.e.
$$\tau((g_r^* g_r)^l) = \frac{m_r}{N}\int x^l \nu_{m_r/n_r}^{(MP)}(x)dx \quad \forall l \geq 1 \tag{35}$$
where $\nu_\lambda^{(MP)}$ is as in (19).
5. The $k+2$ families of elements $(h_r)_{r\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}, (b_{rs})_{r,s\in\{1,\ldots,k\}}, g_1, \ldots, g_k$ are free with amalgamation over $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_0, \ldots, p_{2k}\rangle$.

Note that the right sides of (33) and (34) are deterministic quantities, as they are invariant to the random rotations of H_r and $B_{r,s}$. Also, the condition $p_{k+r} g_r p_r = g_r$, the cyclic property of τ, and (35) completely specify $\tau(w(g_r, g_r^*))$ when $w(g_r, g_r^*)$ is any word in g_r and g_r^*. Then conditions 2–4 above fully specify the $\mathcal{D}$-laws of $\{h_r\}, \{b_{rs}\}, g_1, \ldots, g_k$, and hence condition 5 fully specifies their joint $\mathcal{D}$-law by Proposition 3.9. These elements are a free deterministic equivalent model for $\tilde{H}_r, \tilde{B}_{r,s}, \tilde{G}_r$ in the sense of Definition 3.16. The following technical lemma establishes existence of this model as a von Neumann algebra; its proof is deferred to Appendix D.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.1, there exists a rectangular probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ such that:*
(a) $\mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra and τ is a positive, normal, faithful, trace,
(b) $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_0, \ldots, p_{2k}\rangle$ is a von Neumann sub-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a positive, normal, faithful map between von Neumann algebras,
(c) $\mathcal{A}$ contains elements h_r, b_{rs}, g_r for $r, s = 1, \ldots, k$ that satisfy the above conditions 1–5,
(d) Freeness over $\mathcal{D}$ holds also for the generated von Neumann algebras, i.e. $\langle \mathcal{D}, h_1, \ldots, h_k\rangle_{W^*}$, $\langle \mathcal{D}, b_{11}, b_{12}, \ldots, b_{kk}\rangle_{W^*}$, $\langle \mathcal{D}, g_1\rangle_{W^*}$, ..., $\langle \mathcal{D}, g_k\rangle_{W^*}$ are free with amalgamation over $\mathcal{D}$, and
(e) For any polynomial P (with complex coefficients) in $\{h_r\}, \{b_{rs}\}, \{g_r\}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|\tau(P(\{h_r\}, \{b_{rs}\}, \{g_r\})^l)| \leq C^l$ for all N and all $l \geq 0$.

We now compute the Stieltjes transform of the element corresponding to $\tilde{W}$ in this free model.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 4.1 hold. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ be the rectangular probability space with elements h_r, g_r, b_{rs} as constructed in Lemma 4.2, and let*
$$w = \sum_{r,s=1}^{k} h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s.$$
Let $m_w(z) = -G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ be the Stieltjes transform of $w \in \mathcal{A}$. Then for some constant $C_0 > 0$, defining $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : |z| > C_0\}$, there exist analytic functions $a_1, \ldots, a_k : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_k : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ that satisfy (30), (31), and
$$m_w(z) = -\frac{1}{N}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_s(z) H_s^* H_s\right)\right) - \frac{N-p}{Nz}.$$

Proof. First note that if $H_r = 0$ for some r and the result holds for $w' = \sum_{s,t\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{r\}} h_s^* g_s^* b_{st} g_t h_t$, then it holds also for w by letting a_s and b_s for $s \neq r$ be as in the result for w', setting $a_r \equiv 0$, and defining b_r according to (31). Hence, we may reduce to the case where $H_r \neq 0$ for all r.

Define $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$ by (15) and (16) with $(p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ in place of $(p_1, \ldots, p_d)$. Define the generated von Neumann sub-algebras and associated τ-invariant conditional expectations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \langle \mathcal{D}, h_1, \ldots, h_k \rangle_{W^*}, & \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}} &: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{H}, \\ \mathcal{G} &= \langle \mathcal{D}, g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle_{W^*}, & \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{G}} &: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{G}, \\ \mathcal{B} &= \langle \mathcal{D}, b_{11}, b_{12}, \ldots, b_{kk} \rangle_{W^*}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{G}}$ exist, are unique, and satisfy $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{G}} = \mathbf{F}$ by Proposition D.1 of Appendix D.

The steps of the proof will be to relate the $\mathcal{D}$-valued Cauchy transform of w to that of $v = \sum_{r,s} g_r^* b_{rs} g_s$ by "conditioning on $\mathcal{H}$", then to relate the $\mathcal{D}$-valued Cauchy transform of v to that of $u = \sum_{r,s} b_{rs}$ by "conditioning on $\mathcal{G}$", and finally to compute $G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ via v and u. For $r = 0, \ldots, 2k$, we denote $\tau^{(r)}(a) := \tau(p_r)^{-1}\tau(p_r a p_r)$. (In particular, $\tau^{(r)}(p_r) = 1$.) We denote by $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}$, $\mathcal{R}_a^{\mathcal{H}}$, and $G_a^{\mathcal{H}}$ the $\mathcal{H}$-valued free cumulant functions, $\mathcal{R}$-transform, and Cauchy transform corresponding to $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}}$, and similarly for $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{D}$.

Step 1: We relate the $\mathcal{D}$-valued Cauchy transform of $w = \sum_{r,s} h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s$ to that of $v = \sum_{r,s} g_r^* b_{rs} g_s$ by first working in $\mathcal{H}$. For any $l \geq 1$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_{l-1} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}(wc_1, \ldots, wc_{l-1}, w) \\ &= \kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}\left(\sum_{r=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^k h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s c_1, \ldots, \sum_{r=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^k h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s c_{l-1}, \sum_{r=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^k h_r^* g_r^* b_{rs} g_s h_s\right) \\ &= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^k \kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}(h_{r_1}^* g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} h_{s_1} c_1, \ldots, h_{r_{l-1}}^* g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} h_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1}, h_{r_l}^* g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l} h_{s_l}) \\ &= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^k h_{r_1}^* \kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} h_{s_1} c_1 h_{r_2}^*, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} h_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1} h_{r_l}^*, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l}) h_{s_l} \\ &= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^k h_{r_1}^* \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} \mathbf{F}(h_{s_1} c_1 h_{r_2}^*), \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} \mathbf{F}(h_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1} h_{r_l}^*), g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l}) h_{s_l}, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where the first equality applies the definition of w, the second applies multi-linearity of $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}$, the third applies identities (21,22), and the fourth applies Proposition 3.22 using freeness of $\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{H}$ over $\mathcal{D}$, as guaranteed by Lemma 4.2(d). Note by (16) and the identity $h_r = p_r h_r$ that

$$\mathbf{F}(h_{s_i} c_i h_{r_{i+1}}^*) = \begin{cases} 0 & s_i \neq r_{i+1} \\ p_{s_i} \tau^{(s_i)}(h_{s_i} c_i h_{s_i}^*) & s_i = r_{i+1}. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$, as $d = \tau^{(0)}(d) p_0 + \ldots + \tau^{(2k)}(d) p_{2k}$,

$$h_{r_1}^* d h_{s_l} = \begin{cases} 0 & r_1 \neq s_l \\ h_{r_1}^* h_{r_1} \tau^{(r_1)}(d) & r_1 = s_l. \end{cases}$$

Hence we may restrict the sum in (36) to $s_1 = r_2, \ldots, s_{l-1} = r_l, s_l = r_1$. Noting further that $g_r p_r = g_r$ and $g_r p_s = 0$ for all $r \neq s$, and writing for $i = 1, \ldots, l-1$

$$d_i = \sum_{r=1}^{k} p_r \tau^{(r)}(h_r c_i h_r^*), \tag{37}$$

this implies

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}(wc_1, \ldots, wc_{l-1}, w) = \sum_{r_1,\ldots,r_l=1}^{k} h_{r_1}^* h_{r_1} \tau^{(r_1)} \left(\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 r_2} g_{r_2} d_1, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} r_l} g_{r_l} d_{l-1}, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l r_1} g_{r_1}) \right). \tag{38}$$

Now let $v = \sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} g_r^* b_{rs} g_s$. Then, with d_i as in (37),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(vd_1, \ldots, vd_{l-1}, v) \\
&= \sum_{r_1,s_1,\ldots,r_l,s_l=1}^{k} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} d_1, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} d_{l-1}, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l}) \\
&= \sum_{r_1,s_1,\ldots,r_l,s_l=1}^{k} p_{r_1} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} p_{s_1} d_1 p_{r_2}, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} p_{s_{l-1}} d_{l-1} p_{r_l}, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l}) p_{s_l},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality applies multi-linearity of $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}$ and the second applies $g_r p_r = g_r$ and the identities (21,22). For any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $p_r d p_s = p_r d$ if $r = s$ and 0 otherwise. Hence

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(vd_1, \ldots, vd_{l-1}, v) = \sum_{r_1,\ldots,r_l=1}^{k} p_{r_1} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 r_2} g_{r_2} d_1, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} r_l} g_{r_l} d_{l-1}, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l r_1} g_{r_1}). \tag{39}$$

Comparing with (38),

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{H}}(wc_1, \ldots, wc_{l-1}, w) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} h_r^* h_r \tau^{(r)} \left(\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(vd_1, \ldots, vd_{l-1}, v) \right).$$

Hence for any $c \in \mathcal{H}$, recalling (23) and (37),

$$\mathcal{R}_w^{\mathcal{H}}(c) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} h_r^* h_r \tau^{(r)} \left(\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{D}} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{k} p_s \tau^{(s)}(h_s c h_s^*) \right) \right). \tag{40}$$

Let us write (40) with Cauchy transforms instead of $\mathcal{R}$-transforms. For invertible $d \in \mathcal{D}$, define

$$\alpha_r(d) := \tau^{(r)} \left(h_r G_w^{\mathcal{H}}(d) h_r^* \right), \tag{41}$$

$$\beta_r(d) := \tau^{(r)} \left(\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{D}} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{k} p_s \alpha_s(d) \right) \right). \tag{42}$$

Then (26) and (40) with $c = G_w^{\mathcal{H}}(d)$ imply

$$G_w^{\mathcal{H}}(d) = \left(d - \mathcal{R}_w^{\mathcal{H}} \left(G_w^{\mathcal{H}}(d) \right) \right)^{-1} = \left(d - \sum_{r=1}^{k} h_r^* h_r \beta_r(d) \right)^{-1}. \tag{43}$$

Projecting down to $\mathcal{D}$ using (27) yields

$$G_w^{\mathcal{D}}(d) = \mathbf{F} \left(\left(d - \sum_{r=1}^{k} h_r^* h_r \beta_r(d) \right)^{-1} \right). \tag{44}$$

Applying (43) to (41),

$$\alpha_r(d) = \tau^{(r)}\left(h_r\left(d - \sum_{s=1}^{k} h_s^* h_s \beta_s(d)\right)^{-1} h_r^*\right). \tag{45}$$

As (39) implies $\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{D}}(d) \in \langle p_1, \ldots, p_k\rangle$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we may write (42) as

$$\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{k} p_r \alpha_r(d)\right) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} p_r \beta_r(d).$$

Note $vp_r = 0$ and $p_r v = 0$ if $r = 0$ or $r \in \{k+1, \ldots, 2k\}$. Hence by (23) and multi-linearity of $\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}$, this implies

$$\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r \tilde{\alpha}_r(d)\right) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r \tilde{\beta}_r(d)$$

when $\tilde{\alpha}_r(d) = \alpha_r(d)$ for $r = 1, \ldots, k$, $\tilde{\alpha}_r(d) = d^{-1}$ for $r = 0$ and $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$, $\tilde{\beta}_r(d) = \beta_r(d)$ for $r = 1, \ldots, k$, and $\tilde{\beta}_r(d) = 0$ for $r = 0$ and $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$. Then (25) applied with $b = \sum_r p_r \tilde{\alpha}_r(d)$ yields

$$G_v^{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}_r(d)} + \tilde{\beta}_r(d)\right)\right) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r \tilde{\alpha}_r(d). \tag{46}$$

Equations (44), (45), and (46) hold as identities in $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that d, $\alpha_r(d)$, and $\frac{1}{\alpha_r(d)} + \beta_r(d)$ are invertible for all $r = 1, \ldots, k$ and such that $\|d^{-1}\|$, $|\alpha_r(d)|$, and $|(\frac{1}{\alpha_r(d)} + \beta_r(d))^{-1}|$ are sufficiently small.

Step 2: Next, we relate the $\mathcal{D}$-valued Cauchy transform of v with that of $u = \sum_{r,s} b_{rs}$, by first working in $\mathcal{G}$. For any $l \geq 1$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_{l-1} \in \mathcal{G}$, letting

$$e_i = \sum_{r=1}^{k} p_{r+k} \tau^{(r+k)}(g_r c_i g_r^*) \tag{47}$$

and applying the same arguments as in Step 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_l^{\mathcal{G}}(vc_1, \ldots, vc_{l-1}, v) &= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^{k} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{G}}(g_{r_1}^* b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} c_1, \ldots, g_{r_{l-1}}^* b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1}, g_{r_l}^* b_{r_l s_l} g_{s_l}) \\
&= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^{k} g_{r_1}^* \kappa_l^{\mathcal{G}}(b_{r_1 s_1} g_{s_1} c_1 g_{r_2}^*, \ldots, b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} g_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1} g_{r_l}^*, b_{r_l s_l}) g_{s_l} \\
&= \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^{k} g_{r_1}^* \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(b_{r_1 s_1} \mathbf{F}(g_{s_1} c_1 g_{r_2}^*), \ldots, b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} \mathbf{F}(g_{s_{l-1}} c_{l-1} g_{r_l}^*), b_{r_l s_l}) g_{s_l} \\
&= \sum_{r_1, \ldots, r_l = 1}^{k} g_{r_1}^* g_{r_1} \tau^{(r_1+k)}\left(\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(b_{r_1 r_2} e_1, \ldots, b_{r_{l-1} r_l} e_{l-1}, b_{r_l r_1})\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where we have applied Proposition 3.22 using freeness of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathcal{D}$.

Letting $u = \sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_{rs}$, we may compare the above with

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(ue_1, \ldots, ue_{l-1}, u) = \sum_{r_1, s_1, \ldots, r_l, s_l = 1}^{k} \kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(b_{r_1 s_1} e_1, \ldots, b_{r_{l-1} s_{l-1}} e_{l-1}, b_{r_l s_l})$$

$$= \sum_{r_1,\ldots,r_l=1}^{k} p_{r_1+k}\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(b_{r_1r_2}e_1,\ldots,b_{r_{l-1}r_l}e_{l-1},b_{r_lr_1}), \tag{49}$$

where we have used $p_{r+k}b_{rs}p_{s+k} = b_{rs}$ and, for any $e \in \mathcal{D}$, $p_r e p_r = p_r e$ and $p_r e p_s = 0$ for $r \neq s$. Thus

$$\kappa_l^{\mathcal{G}}(vc_1,\ldots,vc_{l-1},v) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} g_r^* g_r \tau^{(r+k)}\left(\kappa_l^{\mathcal{D}}(ue_1,\ldots,ue_{l-1},u)\right).$$

Hence for any $c \in \mathcal{G}$, recalling (23) and (47),

$$\mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{G}}(c) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} g_r^* g_r \tau^{(r+k)}\left(\mathcal{R}_u^{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{k} p_{s+k}\tau^{(s+k)}(g_s c g_s^*)\right)\right). \tag{50}$$

As in Step 1, we write (50) using Cauchy transforms instead of $\mathcal{R}$-transforms. For invertible $d \in \mathcal{D}$, define

$$\gamma_r(d) = \tau^{(r+k)}(g_r G_v^{\mathcal{G}}(d) g_r^*), \tag{51}$$

$$\delta_r(d) = \tau^{(r+k)}\left(\mathcal{R}_u^{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{k} p_{s+k}\gamma_s(d)\right)\right). \tag{52}$$

Then by (26) and (50) and $c = G_v^{\mathcal{G}}(d)$,

$$G_v^{\mathcal{G}}(d) = \left(d - \mathcal{R}_v^{\mathcal{G}}\left(G_v^{\mathcal{G}}(d)\right)\right)^{-1} = \left(d - \sum_{r=1}^{k} g_r^* g_r \delta_r(d)\right)^{-1}, \tag{53}$$

and projecting down to $\mathcal{D}$ using (27) yields

$$G_v^{\mathcal{D}}(d) = \mathbf{F}\left(\left(d - \sum_{s=1}^{k} g_s^* g_s \delta_s(d)\right)^{-1}\right).$$

For each $r = 1,\ldots,k$, this implies

$$\tau^{(r)}(G_v^{\mathcal{D}}(d)) = \tau^{(r)}\left(p_r\left(d - \sum_{s=1}^{k} g_s^* g_s \delta_s(d)\right)^{-1} p_r\right).$$

As $g_r^* g_r$ has Marcenko-Pastur law by (35), writing $d = d_0 p_0 + \ldots + d_{2k}p_{2k}$ for $d_0,\ldots,d_{2k} \in \mathbb{C}$, this yields for each $r = 1,\ldots,k$

$$\tau^{(r)}(G_v^{\mathcal{D}}(d)) = \int \frac{1}{d_r - x\delta_r(d)} \nu_{m_r/n_r}^{(MP)}(x)dx = \frac{1}{\delta_r(d)} G^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu_{m_r/n_r}^{(MP)}}(d_r/\delta_r(d)), \tag{54}$$

where $G^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu_{m_r/n_r}^{(MP)}}$ denotes the scalar-valued Cauchy transform of this Marcenko-Pastur law. Similarly, applying (53), we may write (51) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_r(d) &= \tau^{(r+k)}\left(g_r\left(d - \sum_{s=1}^{k} g_s^* g_s \delta_s(d)\right)^{-1} g_r^*\right) \\
&= \frac{m_r}{n_r}\tau^{(r)}\left(p_r\left(d - \sum_{s=1}^{k} g_s^* g_s \delta_s(d)\right)^{-1} p_r g_r^* g_r\right) \\
&= \frac{m_r}{n_r}\int \frac{x}{d_r - x\delta_r(d)} \nu_{m_r/n_r}^{(MP)}(x)dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{m_r}{n_r}\left(-\frac{1}{\delta_r(d)} + \frac{d_r}{\delta_r(d)^2} G^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu^{(MP)}_{m_r/n_r}}(d_r/\delta_r(d))\right)$$
$$= \frac{m_r}{n_r}\left(-\frac{1}{\delta_r(d)} + \frac{d_r}{\delta_r(d)}\tau^{(r)}(G^{\mathcal{D}}_v(d))\right), \tag{55}$$

where the second line applies $g_r p_r = g_r$, the cyclic property of τ, and the definitions of $\tau^{(r+k)}$ and $\tau^{(r)}$, and the remaining steps are as above.

By (49), $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{D}}_u(d) \in \langle p_{k+1}, \ldots, p_{2k}\rangle$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$, hence (52) may be written as

$$\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{D}}_u\left(\sum_{r=1}^{k} p_{r+k}\gamma_r(d)\right) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} p_{r+k}\delta_r(d).$$

Note $up_r = 0$ and $p_r u = 0$ for $r = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. Hence by (23) and multi-linearity of $\kappa^{\mathcal{D}}_l$,

$$\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{D}}_u\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r\tilde{\gamma}_r(d)\right) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r\tilde{\delta}_r(d)$$

when $\tilde{\gamma}_r(d) = \gamma_r(d)$ for $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$, $\tilde{\gamma}_r(d) = d^{-1}$ for $r = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, $\tilde{\delta}_r(d) = \delta_r(d)$ for $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$, and $\tilde{\delta}_r(d) = 0$ for $r = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. Then (25) applied with $b = \sum_r p_r\tilde{\gamma}_r(d)$ yields

$$G^{\mathcal{D}}_u\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\gamma}_r(d)} + \tilde{\delta}_r(d)\right)\right) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k} p_r\tilde{\gamma}_r(d). \tag{56}$$

Equations (54), (55), and (56) hold as identities in $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that d, $\gamma_r(d)$, $\frac{1}{\gamma_r(d)} + \delta_r(d)$ are invertible for all $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$ and such that $\|d^{-1}\|$, $|\gamma_r(d)|$, and $|(\frac{1}{\gamma_r(d)} + \delta_r(d))^{-1}|$ are sufficiently small.

Step 3: For sufficiently large $C_0 > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we verify that α_r and β_r are analytic, $\Im\alpha_r < 0$, and the conditions required to apply (44), (45), (46), (54), (55), and (56) all hold. First note that for $z \in \mathbb{C}$, α_r as defined in (41) satisfies

$$\alpha_r(z) = \tau^{(r)}\left(h_r\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}}\left(z^{-1}(wz^{-1})^l\right)h_r^*\right)$$
$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)}\tau(p_r)^{-1}\tau\left(h_r\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{H}}(w^l)h_r^*\right) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)}\frac{N}{m_r}\tau(w^l h_r^* h_r).$$

By Lemma 4.2(e), there exists a constant $C > 0$ (independent of N) such that $\tau(w^l h_r^* h_r) < C^l$ for all N and $l \geq 0$. Then (for sufficiently large C_0 independent of N) $\alpha_r(z)$ defines an analytic function on $\mathbb{D}$, such that $\alpha_r(z) \sim \frac{N}{m_r}\tau(h_r^* h_r)z^{-1}$ as $|z| \to \infty$. In particular, applying the conditions that τ is positive and faithful and H_r is non-zero, $\alpha_r(z) \neq 0$ and $\Im\alpha_r(z) < 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and $|\alpha_r(z)| \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N. Then by (42), $\beta_r(z)$ also defines an analytic function on $\mathbb{D}$ such that $|\beta_r(z)|$ is bounded as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N. Let $\tilde{\alpha}_r$ and $\tilde{\beta}_r$ be as defined in Step 1, and denote for $r = 0, \ldots, 2k$

$$\tilde{d}_r(z) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}_r(z)} + \tilde{\beta}_r(z), \quad \tilde{d}(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k}\tilde{d}_r(z)p_r.$$

Then $\tilde{d}_r(z)$ is invertible and $|\tilde{d}_r(z)| \to \infty$ as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N, for each r. Hence for sufficiently large $C_0 > 0$, we may apply (44), (45), and (46) with $d = z$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Next, note by (51) that γ_r satisfies

$$\gamma_r(d) = \tau^{(r+k)}\left(g_r \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{G}}\left(d^{-1}(vd^{-1})^l\right) g_r^*\right)$$
$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \tau(p_{r+k})^{-1}\tau\left(g_r \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{G}}(d^{-1}(vd^{-1})^l) g_r^*\right) \sim \frac{N}{n_r}\tau(g_r^* g_r) d^{-1}$$

as $\|d^{-1}\| \to 0$. By the same arguments as above, (for sufficiently large C_0) $\gamma_r(\tilde{d}(z))$ is invertible for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and $|\gamma_r(\tilde{d}(z))| \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N. Then by (52), $|\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))|$ is bounded as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N. Let $\tilde{\gamma}_r$ and $\tilde{\delta}_r$ be as defined in Step 2, and denote for $r = 0, \ldots, 2k$

$$\tilde{e}_r(z) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\gamma}_r(\tilde{d}(z))} + \tilde{\delta}_r(\tilde{d}(z)), \quad \tilde{e}(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{2k} \tilde{e}_r(z) p_r.$$

Then $\tilde{e}_r(z)$ is invertible and $|\tilde{e}_r(z)| \to \infty$ as $|z| \to \infty$, uniformly in N, for each r. Hence for sufficiently large C_0, we may apply (54), (55), and (56) with $d = \tilde{d}(z)$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Finally, we compute $G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ using (44), (45), (46), (54), (55), and (56). Note that $h_r^* h_r$ is simple with $p_0 h_r^* h_r p_0 = h_r^* h_r$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, k$. To obtain $G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z)$, we project (44) down to $\mathbb{C}$ using (27) and then apply (33), yielding

$$G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z) = \tau\left(\left(z - \sum_{r=1}^{k} h_r^* h_r \beta_r(z)\right)^{-1}\right) = \frac{1}{N}\operatorname{Tr}\left(z\operatorname{Id}_p - \sum_{r=1}^{k}\beta_r(z) H_r^* H_r\right)^{-1} + \frac{N-p}{Nz}. \tag{57}$$

Similarly, (45) implies

$$\alpha_r(z) = \frac{1}{m_r}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}_p - \sum_{s=1}^{k}\beta_s(z) H_s^* H_s\right)^{-1} H_r^* H_r\right). \tag{58}$$

By (46) and (54),

$$\alpha_r(z) = \tau^{(r)}(G_v^{\mathcal{D}}(\tilde{d}(z))) = \frac{1}{\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))} G^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu^{(MP)}_{m_r/n_r}}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_r(z)\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))} + \frac{\beta_r(z)}{\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))}\right).$$

Applying (26) and the Marcenko-Pastur $\mathcal{R}$-transform $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu^{(MP)}_{\lambda}}(z) = (1-\lambda z)^{-1}$, this is rewritten as

$$\frac{\beta_r(z)}{\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))} = \mathcal{R}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\nu^{(MP)}_{m_r/n_r}}(\alpha_r(z)\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))) = \frac{n_r}{n_r - m_r\alpha_r(z)\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))}. \tag{59}$$

By (55) and (46),

$$\gamma_r(\tilde{d}(z)) = \frac{m_r}{n_r}\frac{\alpha_r(z)\beta_r(z)}{\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))}. \tag{60}$$

By (56) and (34), for each $r = k+1, \ldots, 2k$,

$$\gamma_r(\tilde{d}(z)) = \tau^{(r+k)}(p_{r+k}(\tilde{e}(z) - u)^{-1} p_{r+k})$$
$$= \frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\operatorname{diag}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1(\tilde{d}(z))} + \delta_1(\tilde{d}(z))\right)\operatorname{Id}_{n_1}, \ldots, \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_k(\tilde{d}(z))} + \delta_k(\tilde{d}(z))\right)\operatorname{Id}_{n_k}\right) - B\right)^{-1}_{r,r}, \tag{61}$$

where the notation denotes the trace of the (r,r) block of the matrix inverse, and B is as in the theorem statement.

Eliminating $\gamma_r(\tilde{d}(z))$ and $\delta_r(\tilde{d}(z))$ from (61) using (59) and (60), and rearranging, we obtain

$$\beta_r(z) = \frac{n_r}{m_r^2\alpha_r(z)^2}\left(\operatorname{Tr}\left(\operatorname{diag}\left(\frac{n_1}{m_1\alpha_1(z)}\operatorname{Id}_{n_1},\dots,\frac{n_k}{m_k\alpha_k(z)}\operatorname{Id}_{n_k}\right)-B\right)^{-1}_{r,r} - m_r\alpha_r(z)\right).$$

Denote

$$D := \operatorname{diag}\left(\frac{m_1\alpha_1(z)}{n_1}\operatorname{Id}_{n_1},\dots,\frac{m_k\alpha_k(z)}{n_k}\operatorname{Id}_{n_k}\right),$$

and note that D is invertible for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Applying the Woodbury matrix identity,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_r(z) &= \frac{n_r}{m_r^2\alpha_r(z)^2}(\operatorname{Tr}(D^{-1}-B)^{-1}_{r,r} - m_r\alpha_r(z)) = \frac{n_r}{m_r^2\alpha_r(z)^2}(\operatorname{Tr}(D^{-1}-B)^{-1}_{r,r} - \operatorname{Tr} D_{r,r})\\ &= \frac{n_r}{m_r^2\alpha_r(z)^2}\operatorname{Tr}(D(B^{-1}-D)^{-1}D)_{r,r} = \frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}(B^{-1}-D)^{-1}_{r,r}\\ &= \frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}((\operatorname{Id}_{n_1+\dots+n_k}-BD)^{-1}B)_{r,r}. \qquad (62)\end{aligned}$$

(This holds if B is invertible, and hence (62) holds for all B by continuity.) Letting $a_r(z) = -m_r\alpha_r(z)/n_r$ and $b_r(z) = -\beta_r(z)$, we obtain the desired result from (57), (58), and (62). □

We conclude the proof of Theorem 4.1 by analyzing the fixed-point equations (30) and (31). Following the notation of the theorem, we denote

$$f_r(z,b_1,\dots,b_k) = -\frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(z\operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^k b_s H_s^* H_s\right)^{-1} H_r^* H_r\right),$$

$$g_r(a_1,\dots,a_k) = -\frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\operatorname{Id}_{n_1+\dots+n_k} + BD(a_1,\dots,a_k)\right)^{-1}B\right)_{r,r}.$$

Proofs of the following lemmas are deferred to Appendix C.

Lemma 4.4 ([CL11])**.** *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a connected open set, let $E \subseteq \Omega$ be any set with an accumulation point in Ω, let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ be any two distinct fixed values, and let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of analytic functions $f_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$. If $f_n(z) \notin \{a, b\}$ for all $z \in \Omega$ and $n \geq 1$, and if $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(z)$ exists (and is finite) for each $z \in E$, then $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of Ω to an analytic function.*

Lemma 4.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.1:*

(a) For all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and $b_1,\dots,b_k \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$, $z\operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^k b_s H_s^* H_s$ is invertible, $f_r(z,b_1,\dots,b_k) \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$, and $m_0(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for m_0 as defined by (32).

(b) For all $a_1,\dots,a_k \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $\operatorname{Id}_{n_1+\dots+n_k} + BD(a_1,\dots,a_k)$ is invertible and $g_r(a_1,\dots,a_k) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $C, M > 0$ and let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the space of k-tuples $b = (b_1,\dots,b_k)$ such that each b_r is an analytic function $b_r : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ and $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{C}^+:\Im z>M} \|b(z)\| \leq C$. For sufficiently large C and M (depending on p, n_r, m_r and the matrices H_r and $B_{r,s}$ in Theorem 4.1):*

(a) $\rho : \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\rho(b,\tilde{b}) := \sup_{z\in\mathbb{C}^+:\Im z>M} \|b(z)-\tilde{b}(z)\|$$

is a complete metric on $\mathcal{S}$, and

(b) Letting $g = (g_1,\dots,g_r)$ and $f = (f_1,\dots,f_r)$ where g_r and f_r are as above, $b \mapsto g(f(z,b))$ defines a map from $\mathcal{S}$ to itself, and there exists $c \in (0,1)$ such that for all $b, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\rho(g(f(z,b)), g(f(z,\tilde{b}))) \leq c\rho(b,\tilde{b}).$$

We conclude the proof of Theorem 4.1 using these lemmas, Corollary 3.23, and Theorem 4.3.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $C, M > 0$ be $(p, n_r, m_r$-dependent values) such that the conclusions of Lemma 4.6 hold. Increasing C if necessary, assume $\|b^{(0)}\| < C$ where $b^{(0)} = (b_1^{(0)}, \ldots, b_k^{(0)})$ are the initial values for the iterative procedure of part (c). Lemma 4.6 and the Banach fixed point theorem imply the existence of a unique point $b \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $g(f(z, b)) = b$. Defining $a = f(z, b)$, Lemma 4.5 implies $a(z) \in (\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{0\})^k$ for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Then $a_1(z), \ldots, a_k(z), b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z)$ satisfy (30) and (31) for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ by construction, which verifies existence in part (a). For part (c), define the constant functions $\tilde{b}_r^{(0)}(z) \equiv b_r^{(0)}$ over $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Then $\tilde{b}^{(0)} := (\tilde{b}_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \tilde{b}_r^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{S}$. Define iteratively $\tilde{b}^{(t+1)} = g(f(z, \tilde{b}^{(t)}))$. Then Lemma 4.6 implies

$$c\rho(b, \tilde{b}^{(t)}) \geq \rho(g(f(z, b)), g(f(z, \tilde{b}^{(t)}))) = \rho(b, \tilde{b}^{(t+1)}),$$

for b the above fixed point and some $c \in (0, 1)$. Hence $\rho(b, \tilde{b}^{(t)}) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. This implies by Lemma 4.4 that $\tilde{b}^{(t)}(z) \to b(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, which establishes part (c) upon noting that $\tilde{b}_r^{(t)}(z)$ is exactly the value $b_r^{(t)}$ of the iterative procedure applied at z. Part (c) implies uniqueness in part (a), since $(b_1^{(t)}, \ldots, b_k^{(t)})$ would not converge to $(b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z))$ if this iterative procedure were initialized to a different fixed point. For part (b), Lemma 4.5 verifies that $m_0(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. As $b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z)$ are analytic, $m_0(z)$ is also analytic. Furthermore, as $b \in \mathcal{S}$, $b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z)$ remain bounded as $\Im z \to \infty$, so $m_0(z) \sim -z^{-1}$ as $\Im z \to \infty$. Then m_0 defines the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure μ_0 by [GH03, Lemma 2].

It remains to verify that μ_0 approximates μ_W. Let $h_r, b_{rs}, g_r \in \mathcal{A}$ be the free deterministic equivalent constructed by Lemma 4.2, and let $N = p + m_1 + \ldots + m_k + n_1 + \ldots + n_k$. Uniqueness of the solution $a_1(z), \ldots, a_k(z), b_1(z), \ldots, b_k(z)$ to (30) and (31) in the stated domains implies that the analytic functions $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k$ in Theorem 4.3 must coincide with these values for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then Theorem 4.3 implies, for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$m_0(z) = \frac{N}{p} m_w(z) + \frac{N - p}{pz}.$$

The conditions of Corollary 3.23 are satisfied by Lemma 4.2, so Corollary 3.23 implies $m_{\tilde{W}}(z) - m_w(z) \to 0$ as $p, n_r, m_r \to \infty$, pointwise a.s. over $\mathbb{D}$, where $\tilde{W} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is the embedding of W and $m_{\tilde{W}}$ is its empirical spectral measure. Then

$$m_W(z) = \frac{N}{p} m_{\tilde{W}}(z) + \frac{N - p}{pz},$$

so $m_W(z) - m_0(z) \to 0$ pointwise a.s. over $\mathbb{D}$. In particular, this convergence holds almost surely for all $z \in E$ where E is a countable subset of $\mathbb{D}$ with an accumulation point. As $m_W - m_0$ is uniformly bounded over $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \Im z > \varepsilon\}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, Lemma 4.4 implies $m_W(z) - m_0(z) \to 0$ pointwise a.s. for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Hence $\mu_W - \mu_0 \to 0$ vaguely a.s. (see, e.g., [BS10, Theorem B.9]). By the conditions of the theorem and [YBK88], $\|W\|$ is almost surely bounded by a constant for all large p, n_r, m_r. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.2(e), we have $\tau(w^l) \leq C^l$ for some constant $C > 0$ and all $l \geq 0$, so m_w and m_0 are Stieltjes transforms of probability measures with bounded support. Then the convergence $\mu_W - \mu_0 \to 0$ holds weakly a.s., concluding the proof of the theorem. □

Appendix A. Specializations to specific classification models

In this appendix, we prove Corollaries 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. We denote by $\mathbf{1}_l \in \mathbb{R}^l$ the vector of all 1's and $\mathbf{J}_l := \mathbf{1}_l \mathbf{1}_l^T \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ the matrix of all 1's. We use the convention that for $v \in \mathbb{R}^l$, v denotes also the $l \times 1$ column matrix, and v^T denotes the $1 \times l$ row matrix. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{l' \times m'}$,

we use standard tensor product notation

$$A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \cdots & a_{1m}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{l1}B & \cdots & a_{lm}B \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{ll' \times mm'}.$$

For any $m = l_1 + \ldots + l_k$ and direct sum decomposition $\mathbb{R}^m = \mathbb{R}^{l_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{R}^{l_k}$, we will use the corresponding block matrix decomposition

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{k1} & \cdots & A_{kk} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \;\; A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_j} \;\; \forall i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}.$$

For subspaces $S_1 \subset S_2$ of $\mathbb{R}^m$, we denote by $S_2 \ominus S_1$ the orthogonal complement of S_1 in S_2.

A.1. **One-way classification.** The model (9) may be written in the form (1) upon identifying $k = 2$, $X = \mathbf{1}_n$, $\beta = \mu^T$, $I_1 = I$, $I_2 = n$, $U_2 = \mathrm{Id}_n$, and

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{J_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_{J_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{J_I} \end{pmatrix}, \;\; \alpha_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_I^T \end{pmatrix}, \;\; \alpha_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,1}^T \\ \varepsilon_{1,2}^T \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_{I,J_I}^T \end{pmatrix}.$$

Letting $D = \mathrm{diag}(J_1, \ldots, J_I) \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times I}$ and $U = U_1 D^{-1/2}$, the quantities SS_1 and SS_2 are equivalently expressed as

$$SS_1 = Y^T \left(UU^T - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{J}_n \right) Y, \;\; SS_2 = Y^T \left(\mathrm{Id}_n - UU^T \right) Y.$$

Hence the MANOVA estimators (10) are given by $\hat{\Sigma}_1 = Y^T B_1 Y$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2 = Y^T B_2 Y$ for

$$B_1 = \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{n-1}{(n-I)(I-1)} UU^T - \frac{1}{n-I} \mathrm{Id}_n - \frac{1}{n(I-1)} \mathbf{J}_n \right), \;\; B_2 = \frac{1}{n-I} \mathrm{Id}_n - \frac{1}{n-I} UU^T.$$

Note that the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is asymptotically unaffected by any rank-one perturbation (see e.g. [BS10, Theorem A.43]), so we may disregard the $\mathbf{J}_n$ term in B_1 above. We may also replace B_1 by any matrix $B_1 + \Delta$ such that $\|\Delta\| = o(n^{-1})$, since $\|Y^T \Delta Y\| \to 0$ a.s. by the standard bound $\|Y\| = O(n^{1/2})$ a.s. [YBK88]. Hence, under the given assumptions $p \asymp n \asymp I$, $I/n < C' < 1$, and $\max_i J_i = O(1)$, letting $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-I)}$ be such that $[U \mid V] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an orthogonal matrix, we may consider instead of B_1 the simpler matrix

$$B_1' = \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{n}{(n-I)I} UU^T - \frac{1}{n-I} \mathrm{Id}_n \right) = \frac{1}{KI} UU^T - \frac{1}{K(n-I)} VV^T.$$

Then the matrix M in Theorem 1.2 is given by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} IU_1^T B_1' U_1 & \sqrt{nI} U_1^T B_1' \\ \sqrt{nI} B_1' U_1 & nB_1' \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{K} \begin{pmatrix} D & \sqrt{\frac{n}{I}} D^{1/2} U^T \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{I}} U D^{1/2} & \frac{n}{I} UU^T - \frac{n}{n-I} VV^T \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(I+n) \times (I+n)}.$$

Under the given assumptions, $K, \|D\|, \frac{n}{I}, \frac{n}{n-I} = O(1)$, so the conditions of Theorem 1.2 hold. Defining the orthogonal change of basis matrix

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_I & 0 \\ 0 & [U \mid V] \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(I+n) \times (I+n)},$$



FIGURE 2. Simulated eigenvalues of (a) $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and (b) $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ for the one-way layout model with $n = 1000$, $I = 400$, $J_1 = \ldots = J_{200} = 2$, $J_{201} = \ldots = J_{400} = 3$, $p = 500$, $\Sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, and $\Sigma_2 = 0.5\,\mathrm{Id}_p$. Theoretical predictions of Corollary 2.1 are overlaid in black.

we may compute, in the block-matrix decomposition corresponding to $\mathbb{R}^{I+n} = \mathbb{R}^I \oplus \mathbb{R}^I \oplus \mathbb{R}^{n-I}$,

$$Q^T M Q = \frac{1}{K} \begin{pmatrix} D & \sqrt{\frac{n}{I}} D^{1/2} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{I}} D^{1/2} & \frac{n}{I}\,\mathrm{Id}_I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{n}{n-I}\,\mathrm{Id}_{n-I} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This yields, after some simplification and for some value $*$ (which we omit for brevity),

$$\begin{aligned} &Q^T \left(\mathrm{Id}_{I+n} + MD\left(a_1(z), a_2(z)\right)\right)^{-1} MQ \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{IJ_i}{KI + IJ_i a_1(z) + n a_E(z)}\right) & * & 0 \\ * & \mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{n}{KI + IJ_i a_1(z) + n a_E(z)}\right) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{n}{K(n-I) - n a_E(z)}\,\mathrm{Id}_{n-I} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

As Q preserves the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{I+n} = \mathbb{R}^I \oplus \mathbb{R}^n$, taking block traces yields Corollary 2.1(a).

For $\hat{\Sigma}_2$, we apply Theorem 1.2 with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} IU_1^T B_2 U_1 & \sqrt{nI} U_1^T B_2 \\ \sqrt{nI} B_2 U_1 & nB_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{n}{n-I} V V^T \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(I+n)\times(I+n)}.$$

Then

$$Q^T M Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{n}{n-I}\,\mathrm{Id}_{n-I} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$Q^T \left(\mathrm{Id}_{I+n} + MD\left(a_1(z), a_2(z)\right)\right)^{-1} MQ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{n}{n-I+n a_E(z)}\,\mathrm{Id}_{n-I} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence $b_1(z) \equiv 0$, $a_1(z)$ is irrelevant, and this yields Corollary 2.1(b).

A.2. **Balanced nested classification.** The model (11) may be written in the form (1) upon identifying $I_r = \prod_{r=1}^k J_r$, $X = \mathbf{1}_n$, $\beta = \mu^T$, $U_r = \mathrm{Id}_{J_1 \dots J_r} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{J_{r+1} \dots J_k}$, and

$$\alpha_r = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{(r)^T}_{1,1,\dots,1} \\ \alpha^{(r)^T}_{1,1,\dots,2} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha^{(r)^T}_{J_1,J_2,\dots,J_r} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_k = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon^T_{1,1,\dots,1} \\ \varepsilon^T_{1,1,\dots,2} \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon^T_{J_1,J_2,\dots,J_k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For notational convenience, denote $U_0 = \mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ and $I_0 = 1$. For each $r = 0, \dots, k$, observe that $(J_{r+1} \dots J_k)^{-1/2} U_r U_r^T$ defines a projection onto a subspace S_r of $\mathbb{R}^n$, where these subspaces are nested as $\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{1}_n) = S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \dots \subset S_k = \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we may write the singular value decompositions of $U_0, \dots, U_k$ as

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 &= \sqrt{J_1 J_2 \dots J_k} V_0 W_{00}^T, \\ U_1 &= \sqrt{J_2 \dots J_k}(V_0 W_{01}^T + V_1 W_{11}^T), \\ &\vdots \\ U_k &= \sqrt{1}(V_0 W_{0k}^T + V_1 W_{1k}^T + \dots + V_k W_{kk}^T), \end{aligned}$$

where $V_0 = \mathbf{1}_n/\sqrt{n}$, for each $r \geq 1$ the columns of V_r form an orthonormal basis for $S_r \ominus S_{r-1}$, and for each $r \geq 0$ the matrix $[W_{0r} \mid \dots \mid W_{rr}]$ is an orthogonal matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{I_r \times I_r}$.

The sums-of-squares SS_r may be expressed via projections onto the spaces $S_r \ominus S_{r-1}$ as

$$SS_r = Y^T V_r V_r^T Y \ \ \forall r \geq 1.$$

Then, denoting $V_{k+1} := 0$, the MANOVA estimators (12) are given by $\hat{\Sigma}_r = Y^T B_r Y$ where

$$B_r = \frac{1}{J_{r+1} \dots J_k} \left(\frac{1}{J_1 \dots J_{r-1}(J_r - 1)} V_r V_r^T - \frac{1}{J_1 \dots J_r (J_{r+1} - 1)} V_{r+1} V_{r+1}^T \right) \ \ \forall r \geq 1.$$

Let us first consider $r \leq k-1$. The conditions of Theorem 1.2 are easily verified, so we may apply Theorem 1.2 with

$$M = \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \dots \mid \sqrt{I_k} U_k\right)^T B_r \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \dots \mid \sqrt{I_k} U_k\right) =: U^T B_r U.$$

Defining the orthogonal change-of-basis matrix

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} [W_{01} \mid W_{11}] & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & [W_{02} \mid W_{12} \mid W_{22}] & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & [W_{0k} \mid \dots \mid W_{kk}] \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(I_1 + I_2 + \dots + I_k) \times (I_1 + I_2 + \dots + I_k)},$$

and moving to the expanded block-matrix decomposition corresponding to

$$\mathbb{R}^{I_1 + I_2 + \dots + I_k} = (\mathbb{R}^{I_0} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_1 - I_0}) \oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_0} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_1 - I_0} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_2 - I_1}) \oplus \dots \oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_0} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_1 - I_0} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_k - I_{k-1}}),$$

the rows of $Q^T U^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(I_1 + \dots + I_k) \times n}$ for the matrix U defined above may be divided into blocks corresponding to this decomposition, with the block corresponding to each $\mathbb{R}^{I_0}$ term given by $\sqrt{n} V_0^T$ and the block corresponding to each $\mathbb{R}^{I_s - I_{s-1}}$ term given by $\sqrt{n} V_s^T$ for $s \geq 1$. Furthermore, for each $s \geq 1$, there are $k + 1 - s$ blocks equal to $\sqrt{n} V_s^T$. Letting P^T be a permutation matrix such that $P^T Q^T U^T$ equals $Q^T U^T$ with rows permuted so that all blocks equal to $\sqrt{n} V_r^T$ come first, followed by all blocks equal to $\sqrt{n} V_{r+1}^T$, followed by the remaining blocks, we obtain

$$P^T Q^T M Q P = P^T Q^T U^T B_r U Q P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{J_r}{J_r - 1} \mathbf{J}_{k+1-r} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_r - I_{r-1}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{J_{r+1} - 1} \mathbf{J}_{k-r} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_{r+1} - I_r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

under the collapsed decomposition

$$\mathbb{R}^{I_1+I_2+\ldots+I_k} = \mathbb{R}^{(I_r-I_{r-1})(k+1-r)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{(I_{r+1}-I_r)(k-r)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_1+\ldots+I_k-(I_r-I_{r-1})(k+1-r)-(I_{r+1}-I_r)(k-r)}.$$

Correspondingly,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^TQ^TD(a_1(z),\ldots,a_k(z))QP \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{diag}(a_r(z),\ldots,a_k(z)) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_r-I_{r-1}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \operatorname{diag}(a_{r+1}(z),\ldots,a_k(z)) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_{r+1}-I_r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for some matrix $*$. For any diagonal matrix $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_1,\ldots,d_l) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the Sherman-Morrison formula yields

$$(D + c\mathbf{J}_l)^{-1} = (D + c\mathbf{1}_l\mathbf{1}_l^T)^{-1} = D^{-1} - \frac{D^{-1}c\mathbf{J}_lD^{-1}}{1 + c\mathbf{1}_l^TD^{-1}\mathbf{1}_l}.$$

Then, letting $D_r = \operatorname{diag}(a_r(z),\ldots,a_k(z))$ and $D_{r+1} = \operatorname{diag}(a_{r+1}(z),\ldots,a_k(z))$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^TQ^T\left(M + D(a_1(z),\ldots,a_k(z))^{-1}\right)^{-1}QP \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \left(D_r - \frac{J_rD_r\mathbf{J}_{k+1-r}D_r}{J_r-1+J_r\mathbf{1}_{k+1-r}^TD_r\mathbf{1}_{k+1-r}}\right) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_r-I_{r-1}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \left(D_{r+1} + \frac{D_{r+1}\mathbf{J}_{k-r}D_{r+1}}{J_{r+1}-1-\mathbf{1}_{k-r}^TD_{r+1}\mathbf{1}_{k-r}}\right) \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_{r+1}-I_r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the identity $(\mathrm{Id} + MD)^{-1}M = D^{-1}(M + D^{-1})^{-1}M$ and simplifying,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^TQ^T\left(\mathrm{Id} + MD(a_1(z),\ldots,a_k(z))\right)^{-1}MQP \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{J_r}{J_r-1+J_r\mathbf{1}_{k+1-r}^TD_r\mathbf{1}_{k+1-r}}\mathbf{J}_{k+1-r} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_r-I_{r-1}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{J_{r+1}-1-\mathbf{1}_{k-r}^TD_{r+1}\mathbf{1}_{k-r}}\mathbf{J}_{k-r} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_{r+1}-I_r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Undoing the permutations by applying P on the left and P^T on the right, noting that Q preserves the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_k}$, and taking the block trace with respect to this decomposition, this implies for $s = 1,\ldots,k$

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\mathrm{Id} + MD(a_1(z),\ldots,a_k(z))\right)^{-1}M\right)_{s,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & s < r \\ \frac{(I_r-I_{r-1})J_r}{J_r-1+J_r\sum_{j=r}^k a_j(z)} & s = r \\ \frac{(I_r-I_{r-1})J_r}{J_r-1+J_r\sum_{j=r}^k a_j(z)} - \frac{I_{r+1}-I_r}{J_{r+1}-1-\sum_{j=r+1}^k a_j(z)} & s \geq r+1. \end{cases}$$

Noting $I_r - I_{r-1} = J_1\ldots J_{r-1}(J_r - 1)$, this yields Corollary 2.2 for the cases $r \leq k-1$. The $r = k$ case is similar and omitted for brevity.

(As in Appendix A.1 for the one-way layout design, since $J_1 - 1 \asymp J_1$ and $V_0V_0^T$ is a matrix of rank one, we may have considered instead of B_1 the simpler matrix

$$B_1' = \frac{1}{J_2\ldots J_k}\left(\frac{1}{J_1}(V_0V_0^T + V_1V_1^T) - \frac{1}{J_1(J_2-1)}V_2V_2^T\right).$$

Doing so in the above derivation would have led to Corollary 2.2 with all appearances of the quantity $(J_1-1)/(J_1-1+J_1\sum_{j=1}^k a_j(z))$ replaced by $1/(1+\sum_{j=1}^k a_j(z))$.)



FIGURE 3. Simulated eigenvalues of (a) $\hat{\Sigma}_1$, (b) $\hat{\Sigma}_2$, and (c) $\hat{\Sigma}_3$ for the nested two-way model with $n = 2400$, $J_1 = 400$, $J_2 = 2$, $J_3 = 3$, $p = 500$, $\Sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_2 = 0.5\,\mathrm{Id}_p$, and $\Sigma_3 = 2\,\mathrm{Id}_p$. Theoretical predictions of Corollary 2.2 are overlaid in black.

A.3. **Replicated crossed two-way classification.** The model (13) may be written in the form (1) upon identifying $k = 5$, $I_1 = I$, $I_2 = IJ$, $I_3 = IK$, $I_4 = IJK$, $I_5 = n$, $X = \mathbf{1}_n$, $\beta = \mu^T$, $U_1 = \mathrm{Id}_I \otimes \mathbf{1}_{JKL}$, $U_2 = \mathrm{Id}_{IJ} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{KL}$, $U_3 = \mathrm{Id}_I \otimes \mathbf{1}_J \otimes \mathrm{Id}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_L$, $U_4 = \mathrm{Id}_{IJK} \otimes \mathbf{1}_L$, $U_5 = \mathrm{Id}_n$, and

$$\alpha_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_I^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{1,1}^T \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{I,J}^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{1,1}^T \\ \vdots \\ \gamma_{I,K} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{1,1,1}^T \\ \vdots \\ \delta_{I,J,K} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_5 = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,1,1,1}^T \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_{I,J,K,L}^T \end{pmatrix}.$$

We observe that $(JKL)^{-1/2}U_1U_1^T$, $(KL)^{-1/2}U_2U_2^T$, $(JL)^{-1/2}U_3U_3^T$, $L^{-1/2}U_4U_4^T$, and $U_5U_5^T$ define projections onto certain subspaces $S_1, \ldots, S_5$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, respectively, with $S_1 \subset S_2$, $S_1 \subset S_3$, $S_2 \ominus S_1$ orthogonal to $S_3 \ominus S_1$, $\mathrm{span}(S_2, S_3) \subset S_4$, and $S_4 \subset S_5 = \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence the singular value decompositions of $U_1, \ldots, U_5$ may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
U_1 &= \sqrt{JKL}V_1W_{11}^T, \\
U_2 &= \sqrt{KL}(V_1W_{12}^T + V_2W_{22}^T), \\
U_3 &= \sqrt{JL}(V_1W_{13}^T + V_3W_{33}^T), \\
U_4 &= \sqrt{L}(V_1W_{14}^T + V_2W_{24}^T + V_3W_{34}^T + V_4W_{44}^T), \\
U_5 &= \sqrt{1}(V_1W_{15}^T + V_2W_{25}^T + V_3W_{35}^T + V_4W_{45}^T + V_5W_{55}^T),
\end{aligned}$$

where the columns of $V_1, \ldots, V_5$ form orthonormal bases for S_1, $S_2 \ominus S_1$, $S_3 \ominus S_1$, $S_4 \ominus \mathrm{span}(S_2, S_3)$, and $S_5 \ominus S_4$ respectively, and where W_{11}, $[W_{12} \mid W_{22}]$, ..., $[W_{15} \mid \cdots \mid W_{55}]$ are orthogonal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{I_1}$, $\mathbb{R}^{I_2}$, ..., $\mathbb{R}^{I_5}$.

The sums-of-squares $SS_1, \dots, SS_5$ may be expressed as

$$SS_1 = Y^T \left(V_1 V_1^T - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_n \right) Y, \quad SS_r = Y^T V_r V_r^T Y \ \ \forall r \geq 2.$$

Hence the MANOVA estimators (14) are given by $\hat{\Sigma}_r = Y^T B_r Y$ for

$$B_1 = \frac{1}{JKL} \left(\frac{1}{I-1} \left(V_1 V_1^T - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{J}_n \right) - \frac{1}{I(J-1)} V_2 V_2^T - \frac{1}{I(K-1)} V_3 V_3^T + \frac{1}{I(J-1)(K-1)} V_4 V_4^T \right),$$

$$B_2 = \frac{1}{KL} \left(\frac{1}{I(J-1)} V_2 V_2^T - \frac{1}{I(J-1)(K-1)} V_4 V_4^T \right),$$

$$B_3 = \frac{1}{JL} \left(\frac{1}{I(K-1)} V_3 V_3^T - \frac{1}{I(J-1)(K-1)} V_4 V_4^T \right),$$

$$B_4 = \frac{1}{L} \left(\frac{1}{I(J-1)(K-1)} V_4 V_4^T - \frac{1}{IJK(L-1)} V_5 V_5^T \right),$$

$$B_5 = \frac{1}{IJK(L-1)} V_5 V_5^T.$$

As in Appendix A.1 for one-way classification, we may consider instead of B_1 the simpler matrix

$$B_1' = \frac{1}{JKL} \left(\frac{1}{I} V_1 V_1^T - \frac{1}{I(J-1)} V_2 V_2^T - \frac{1}{I(K-1)} V_3 V_3^T + \frac{1}{I(J-1)(K-1)} V_4 V_4^T \right).$$

For each $\hat{\Sigma}_r$, the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are easily verified. For $\hat{\Sigma}_1$, we take

$$M = \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \cdots \mid \sqrt{I_5} U_5 \right)^T B_1' \left(\sqrt{I_1} U_1 \mid \cdots \mid \sqrt{I_5} U_5 \right) =: U^T B_1' U.$$

Defining the orthogonal change-of-basis matrix

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & [W_{12} \mid W_{22}] & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & [W_{13} \mid W_{33}] & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & [W_{14} \mid W_{24} \mid W_{34} \mid W_{44}] & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & [W_{15} \mid W_{25} \mid W_{35} \mid W_{45} \mid W_{55}] \end{pmatrix},$$

and moving to the expanded block-matrix decomposition corresponding to

$$\mathbb{R}^{I_1+I_2+I_3+I_4+I_5} = \mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_2-I_1}) \oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_3-I_1}) \oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_2-I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_3-I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1})$$
$$\oplus (\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_2-I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_3-I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_5-I_4}),$$

the rows of $Q^T U^T$ may be divided into blocks corresponding to this decomposition, with the blocks corresponding to the $\mathbb{R}^{I_1}$, $\mathbb{R}^{I_2-I_1}$, $\mathbb{R}^{I_3-I_1}$, $\mathbb{R}^{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1}$, and $\mathbb{R}^{I_5-I_4}$ terms given respectively by $\sqrt{n} V_1^T$, $\sqrt{n} V_2^T$, $\sqrt{n} V_3^T$, $\sqrt{n} V_4^T$, and $\sqrt{n} V_5^T$. Letting P^T be a permutation matrix such that $P^T Q^T U^T$ equals $Q^T U^T$ with rows permuted so that all $\sqrt{n} V_1^T$ blocks come first, followed by all $\sqrt{n} V_2^T$ blocks, etc., we obtain

$$P^T Q^T M Q P = P^T Q^T U^T B_1' U Q P$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_5 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{J-1} \mathbf{J}_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_2-I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{K-1} \mathbf{J}_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_3-I_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{(J-1)(K-1)} \mathbf{J}_2 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Correspondingly,

$$P^T Q^T D(a_1(z), a_2(z), a_3(z), a_4(z), a_5(z)) Q P$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} D_1 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_2 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_2-I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_3-I_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D_4 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & D_5 \,\mathrm{Id}_{I_5-I_4} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D_1 := \mathrm{diag}(a_1(z), a_2(z), a_3(z), a_4(z), a_5(z)), \;\; D_2 := \mathrm{diag}(a_2(z), a_4(z), a_5(z)),$$
$$D_3 := \mathrm{diag}(a_3(z), a_4(z), a_5(z)), \;\; D_4 := \mathrm{diag}(a_4(z), a_5(z)), \;\; D_5 = a_5(z).$$

Then similar computations as in Appendix A.2 yield

$$P^T Q^T \left(\mathrm{Id} + MD(a_1(z), \ldots, a_5(z))^{-1}\right)^{-1} MQP$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \mathbf{J}_5 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 \mathbf{J}_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_2-I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_3 \mathbf{J}_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_3-I_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c_4 \mathbf{J}_2 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$c_1 := \tfrac{1}{1+\mathbf{1}_5^T D_1 \mathbf{1}_5}, \;\; c_2 := -\tfrac{1}{J-1-\mathbf{1}_3^T D_2 \mathbf{1}_3}, \;\; c_3 := -\tfrac{1}{K-1-\mathbf{1}_3^T D_3 \mathbf{1}_3}, \;\; c_4 := \tfrac{1}{(J-1)(K-1)+\mathbf{1}_2^T D_4 \mathbf{1}_2}.$$

Applying P on the left and P^T on the right, noting that Q preserves $\mathbb{R}^{I_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}^{I_5}$, and taking the block trace,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left(\mathrm{Id} + MD(a_1(z), \ldots, a_5(z))\right)^{-1} M\right)_{s,s}$$
$$= \begin{cases} \frac{I_1}{1+\sum_{j=1}^5 a_j(z)} & s = 1 \\ \frac{I_1}{1+\sum_{j=1}^5 a_j(z)} - \frac{I_2-I_1}{J-1-a_2(z)-a_4(z)-a_5(z)} & s = 2 \\ \frac{I_1}{1+\sum_{j=1}^5 a_j(z)} - \frac{I_3-I_1}{K-1-a_3(z)-a_4(z)-a_5(z)} & s = 3 \\ \frac{I_1}{1+\sum_{j=1}^5 a_j(z)} - \frac{I_2-I_1}{J-1-a_2(z)-a_4(z)-a_5(z)} - \frac{I_3-I_1}{K-1-a_3(z)-a_4(z)-a_5(z)} + \frac{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1}{(J-1)(K-1)+a_4(z)+a_5(z)} & s \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

For $\hat{\Sigma}_2$, we apply Theorem 1.2 with $M = U^T B_2 U$ where U is as defined above. Then for Q and P as above, similar arguments yield

$$P^T Q^T MQP = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{J}{J-1} \mathbf{J}_3 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_2-I_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{J}{(J-1)(K-1)} \mathbf{J}_2 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left(\mathrm{Id} + MD(a_1(z), \ldots, a_5(z))\right)^{-1} M\right)_{s,s}$$
$$= \begin{cases} 0 & s = 1 \text{ or } 3 \\ \frac{(I_2-I_1)J}{J-1+J(a_2(z)+a_4(z)+a_5(z))} & s = 2 \\ \frac{(I_2-I_1)J}{J-1+J(a_2(z)+a_4(z)+a_5(z))} - \frac{(I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1)J}{(J-1)(K-1)-J(a_4(z)+a_5(z))} & s = 4 \text{ or } 5. \end{cases}$$

For $\hat{\Sigma}_4$, we apply Theorem 1.2 with $M = UB_4U^T$. Similar arguments yield

$$P^T Q^T MQP = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{JK}{(J-1)(K-1)} \mathbf{J}_2 \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{L-1} \mathrm{Id}_{I_5-I_4} \end{pmatrix},$$



FIGURE 4. Simulated eigenvalues of (a) $\hat{\Sigma}_1$, (b) $\hat{\Sigma}_2$, (c) $\hat{\Sigma}_3$, (d) $\hat{\Sigma}_4$, and (e) $\hat{\Sigma}_5$ for the replicated crossed two-way model with $n = 4800$, $I = 400$, $J = 2$, $K = 3$, $L = 2$, $p = 500$, $\Sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_2 = 0.5\,\mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_3 = 2\,\mathrm{Id}_p$, $\Sigma_4 = 2.5\,\mathrm{Id}_p$, and $\Sigma_5 = 3\,\mathrm{Id}_p$. Theoretical predictions of Corollary 2.3 are overlaid in black.

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left(\mathrm{Id}+MD(a_1(z),\dots,a_5(z))\right)^{-1}M\right)_{s,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & s \le 3 \\ \frac{(I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1)JK}{(J-1)(K-1)+JK(a_4(z)+a_5(z))} & s = 4 \\ \frac{(I_4-I_2-I_3+I_1)JK}{(J-1)(K-1)+JK(a_4(z)+a_5(z))} - \frac{I_5-I_4}{L-1-a_5(z)} & s = 5. \end{cases}$$

For $\hat{\Sigma}_5$, we apply Theorem 1.2 with $M = UB_5U^T$, yielding

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left(\mathrm{Id}+MD(a_1(z),\dots,a_5(z))\right)^{-1}M\right)_{s,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & s \le 4 \\ \frac{(I_5-I_4)L}{L-1+La_5(z)} & s = 5. \end{cases}$$

Combining these computations and recalling the definitions of $I_1,\dots,I_5$ yields Corollary 2.3.

Appendix B. Proofs of Theorem 3.17 and Corollary 3.23

Lemma B.1. *Let $O \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ be a random Haar-distributed real orthogonal matrix, let $K \geq 1$ be any positive integer, and let $i_1, j_1, \ldots, i_K, j_K \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.*

(a) There exists $C := C_K > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[|O_{i_1j_1} \ldots O_{i_Kj_K}|] \leq CN^{-K/2}$.

(b) If there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $i_k = i$ for an odd number of indices $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ or $j_k = i$ for an odd number of indices $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, then $\mathbb{E}[O_{i_1j_1} \ldots O_{i_Kj_K}] = 0$.

Proof. Part (a) follows from, e.g., [CŚ06, Corollary 3.4 and Theorem 3.13]. Part (b) follows from the fact that the distribution of O is invariant to multiplication of row i or column i by -1, hence if $i_k = i$ or $j_k = i$ for an odd number of indices k, then $\mathbb{E}[O_{i_1j_1} \ldots O_{i_Kj_K}] = -\mathbb{E}[O_{i_1j_1} \ldots O_{i_Kj_K}]$. □

Lemma B.2. *Let $(O(l,r))_{l\in\mathbb{N},r\in\{1,\ldots,d\}}$ be independent random matrices such that, for each l and r, $O(l,r)$ is a Haar-distributed orthogonal matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{N_r\times N_r}$. Fix $K \geq 1$ and $r_1, \ldots, r_K \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, and consider deterministic matrices $D(1) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_1}\times N_{r_2}}, D(2) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_2}\times N_{r_3}}, \ldots, D(K) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_K}\times N_{r_1}}$ such that, for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$ (and identifying $r_{K+1} := r_1$), one of the following is true:*

- *$r_k = r_{k+1}$ and $D(k) = \mathrm{Id}_{N_{r_k}}$,*
- *$r_k = r_{k+1}$ and $\operatorname{Tr} D(k) = 0$, or*
- *$r_k \neq r_{k+1}$.*

Consider any $m_1, \ldots, m_K \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$, and any indices $l_1, \ldots, l_k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $l_k \neq l_{k+1}$ if $r_k = r_{k+1}$ and $D(k) = \mathrm{Id}_{N_{r_k}}$. Let $N = N_1 + \ldots + N_d$ and suppose that there exist $C, c > 0$ such that $c < N_r/N < C$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, d$ and $\max_{k=1}^K \|D(k)\| \leq C$. Then, almost surely as $N \to \infty$,

$$N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}\Big(O(l_1,r_1)^{m_1} D(1) O(l_2,r_2)^{m_2} D(2) \ldots O(l_K,r_K)^{m_K} D(K)\Big) \to 0.$$

Proof. The proof generalizes that of [HP00, Theorem 2.1] to extend from the unitary to the orthogonal setting. (It is also similar to that of [BG09, Proposition 4.4], although the combinatorial details are more complicated since we cannot assume that $D(1), \ldots, D(K)$ are diagonal.)

Let $M = |m_1| + \ldots + |m_K|$. For each $s = 1, \ldots, K$, let $M(s) = |m_1| + \ldots + |m_s|$, and let $M(0) = 0$. For each $h \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, there is $s \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ such that $M(s-1) + 1 \leq h \leq M(s)$; let $l(h) = l_s$, $r(h) = r_s$, and $e(h) = \operatorname{sign}(m_s) \in \{-1, 1\}$. Finally, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, denote $V(l, r, 1) = O(l, r)$ and $V(l, r, -1) = O(l, r)^{-1} = O(l, r)^T$. Then, expanding the trace,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E} &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}\Big(O(l_1,r_1)^{m_1} D(1) \ldots O(l_K,r_K)^{m_K} D(K)\Big)\right|^2\right] \\
&= N^{-2}\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\operatorname{Tr}\Big(O(l_1,r_1)^{m_1} D(1) \ldots O(l_K,r_K)^{m_K} D(K)\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad \operatorname{Tr}\Big(O(l_1,r_1)^{m_1} \overline{D(1)} \ldots O(l_K,r_K)^{m_K} \overline{D(K)}\Big)\Bigg] \\
&= N^{-2} \sum_{i_1=1}^{N_{r(1)}} \sum_{i_2=1}^{N_{r(2)}} \cdots \sum_{i_M=1}^{N_{r(M)}} \sum_{j_{M(1)}=1}^{N_{r(M(1))}} \cdots \sum_{j_{M(K)}=1}^{N_{r(M(K))}} \sum_{i'_1=1}^{N_{r(1)}} \sum_{i'_2=1}^{N_{r(2)}} \cdots \sum_{i'_M=1}^{N_{r(M)}} \sum_{j'_{M(1)}=1}^{N_{r(M(1))}} \cdots \sum_{j'_{M(K)}=1}^{N_{r(M(K))}} \\
&\quad \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} \overline{D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{h=1}^{M} V(l(h), r(h), e(h))_{i_h j_h} \prod_{h=1}^{M} V(l(h), r(h), e(h))_{i'_h j'_h}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where j_h, j'_h for $h \notin \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$ are defined by $j_h = i_{h+1}$ and $j'_h = i'_{h+1}$ (and where we cyclically identify $i_{M(K)+1} = i_{M+1} := i_1$ and $i'_{M(K)+1} = i'_{M+1} := i'_1$). Since $r(h) = r(h+1)$ for each $h \notin \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$, note that this implies $1 \leq i_h, i'_h, j_h, j'_h \leq N_{r(h)}$ for each $h \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$.

For every tuple of indices $(i_1, j_1, \ldots, i_M, j_M, i'_1, j'_1, \ldots, i'_M, j'_M)$ appearing above, define

$$E(i_1, j_1, \ldots, i_M, j_M, i'_1, j'_1, \ldots, i'_M, j'_M)$$

$$:= \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{h=1}^{M} V(l(h),r(h),e(h))_{i_h j_h} \prod_{h=1}^{M} V(l(h),r(h),e(h))_{i'_h j'_h}\right]$$

$$= \prod_{l\in\mathbb{N}}\prod_{r=1}^{d} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{\substack{h\in\{1,\dots,M\}\\(l(h),r(h))=(l,r)}} V(l,r,e(h))_{i_h j_h} V(l,r,e(h))_{i'_h j'_h}\right],$$

where the second equality uses independence of the matrices $O(l,r)$. Then by Lemma B.1(a),

$$|E(i_1,j_1,\dots,i_M,j_M,i'_1,j'_1,\dots,i'_M,j'_M)| \le CN^{-M}$$

for a constant $C := C_M > 0$. Furthermore, let $[M]_I, [M]'_I, [M]_J, [M]'_J$ denote four different copies of the set $\{1,\dots,M\}$ and denote $[M]_{\times 4} = [M]_I \sqcup [M]'_I \sqcup [M]_J \sqcup [M]'_J$ (so $|[M]_{\times 4}| = 4M$). Then by Lemma B.1(b), $E(i_1,j_1,\dots,i_M,j_M,i'_1,j'_1,\dots,i'_M,j'_M) = 0$ unless, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \{1,\dots,d\}$, and $i \in \{1,\dots,N_r\}$, both of the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A(l,r,i) := {} & \{h \in [M]_I : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,1), i_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]'_I : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,1), i'_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]_J : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,-1), j_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]'_J : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,-1), j'_h = i\} \subseteq [M]_{\times 4} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B(l,r,i) := {} & \{h \in [M]_I : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,-1), i_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]'_I : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,-1), i'_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]_J : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,1), j_h = i\} \\ & \sqcup \{h \in [M]'_J : (l(h),r(h),e(h)) = (l,r,1), j'_h = i\} \subseteq [M]_{\times 4} \end{aligned}$$

have even cardinality.

Any index tuple $(i_1,j_1,\dots,i_M,j_M,i'_1,j'_1,\dots,i'_M,j'_M)$ defines a partition $\mathcal{Q}$ of $[M]_{\times 4}$ according to which of these indices are distinct. I.e., for any $h,g \in \{1,\dots,M\}$, denote $h \in [M]_I$ as the copy of h in $[M]_I$, etc., and denote $a \overset{\mathcal{Q}}{\sim} b$ if a,b are in the same element of $\mathcal{Q}$. Then $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} i_h = i_g &\Leftrightarrow h \in [M]_I \overset{\mathcal{Q}}{\sim} g \in [M]_I, \\ i_h = i'_g &\Leftrightarrow h \in [M]_I \overset{\mathcal{Q}}{\sim} g \in [M]_{I'}, \\ i_h = j_g &\Leftrightarrow h \in [M]_I \overset{\mathcal{Q}}{\sim} g \in [M]_J, \\ i_h = j'_g &\Leftrightarrow h \in [M]_I \overset{\mathcal{Q}}{\sim} g \in [M]_{J'}, \end{aligned}$$

etc. Note that by invariance of the distribution of $O(j,r)$ to permutations of rows and columns, $E(i_1,j_1,\dots,i'_M,j'_M)$ is the same for all index tuples obeying the ranges $1 \le i_h,i'_h,j_h,j'_h \le N_{r(h)}$ and defining the same partition $\mathcal{Q}$; hence let us write $E(\mathcal{Q}) := E(i_1,j_1,\dots,i'_M,j'_M)$. The condition "$|A(l,r,i)|$ and $|B(l,r,i)|$ are even for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \{1,\dots,d\}$, and $i \in \{1,\dots,N_r\}$" depends also only on $\mathcal{Q}$; let us call $\mathcal{Q}$ "good" if this condition and the condition $j_h = i_{h+1}$ and $j'_h = i'_{h+1}$ for all $h \notin \{M(1),\dots,M(K)\}$ both hold. Then by the above observations,

$$\mathcal{E} = N^{-2} \sum_{\mathcal{Q}\text{ good}} E(\mathcal{Q}) \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}'|\mathcal{Q}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}$$

$$\leq CN^{-2-M} \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \text{ good}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}'|\mathcal{Q}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}} \right|,$$

where the first sum in each line is over all good partitions $\mathcal{Q}$ of $[M]_{\times 4}$, and the second is over all index tuples $(i_1, j_1, \ldots, i'_M, j'_M)$ obeying the ranges $1 \leq i_h, i'_h, j_h, j'_h \leq N_{r(h)}$ for each $h = 1, \ldots, M$ and inducing the partition $\mathcal{Q}$.

Consider any good partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{S_1, \ldots, S_{|\mathcal{Q}|}\}$ where $S_1, \ldots, S_{|\mathcal{Q}|}$ are the disjoint subsets of $[M]_{\times 4}$ that comprise $\mathcal{Q}$. Denote

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) := \left| \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}'|\mathcal{Q}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}} \right|.$$

Goodness of $\mathcal{Q}$ implies $|A(l,r,i)|$ and $|B(l,r,i)|$ are even for each l, r, and i, which implies, in particular, that $|S|$ must be even for each $S \in \mathcal{Q}$. Suppose S is a set in $\mathcal{Q}$ of cardinality $|S| = 2$. If S contains some $h \in [M]_J$ with $h \notin \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$, then as $j_h = i_{h+1}$, S must consist of $h \in [M]_J$ and $h+1 \in [M]_I$. But $l(h) = l(h+1)$, $r(h) = r(h+1)$, and $e(h) = e(h+1)$ for such h, so $|A(l(h), r(h), j_h)| = 1$ and $|B(l(h), r(h), j_h)| = 1$, contradicting goodness of $\mathcal{Q}$. Hence S cannot contain any such $h \in [M]_J$. Similarly, S cannot contain any $h \in [M]'_J$ with $h \notin \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$, any $h \in [M]_I$ with $h \notin \{M(1)+1, \ldots, M(K)+1\}$, and any $h \in [M]'_I$ with $h \notin \{M(1)+1, \ldots, M(K)+1\}$, so we must have

$$S \subseteq \Big\{h \in [M]_I \cap \{M(1)+1, \ldots, M(K)+1\}\Big\} \sqcup \Big\{h \in [M]'_I \cap \{M(1)+1, \ldots, M(K)+1\}\Big\}$$
$$\sqcup \Big\{h \in [M]_J \cap \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}\Big\} \sqcup \Big\{h \in [M]'_J \cap \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}\Big\}.$$

Let us call S "type-A" if S consists of two indices that correspond to the same matrix $D(s)$ in the definition of $D(\mathcal{Q})$ above, i.e., if S consists of $h \in [M]_J \cap \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$ and $h+1 \in [M]_I$, or $h \in [M]'_J \cap \{M(1), \ldots, M(K)\}$ and $h+1 \in [M]'_I$. Let us call S "type-B" otherwise.

Suppose $\mathcal{Q}$ contains some type-A set S. For notational convenience, suppose S consists of $M(1) \in [M]_J$ and $M(1)+1 \in [M]_I$ (so $j_{M(1)} = i_{M(1)+1}$, and this is distinct from all other indices). Then, separating out the sum over $j_{M(1)}$, we may write

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) = \left| \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus S | \mathcal{Q} \setminus S} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,N_{r_1}\} \\ j \notin \mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus S}} D(1)_{jj} \right) \prod_{s=2}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} \overline{D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}} \right|,$$

where $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \setminus S$ denotes all indices except $j_{M(1)}$ and $i_{M(1)+1}$, the first sum is over all such indices which obey the distinctness conditions imposed by $\mathcal{Q} \setminus S$ (the partition $\mathcal{Q}$ with S removed), and the second sum is over indices j that are distinct from those in $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \setminus S$. As S is a type-A set, in order for $|A(l_1, r_1, j_{M(1)})|$ and $|B(l_1, r_1, j_{M(1)})|$ to be even, we must have $l_1 = l_2$, $r_1 = r_2$, and $e_1 = -e_2$, which implies by the assumptions of the lemma that $\operatorname{Tr} D(1) = 0$. Then

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) = \left| \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus S | \mathcal{Q} \setminus S} \left(0 - \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,N_{r_1}\} \\ j \in \mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus S}} D(1)_{jj} \right) \prod_{s=2}^{K} D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}} \prod_{s=1}^{K} \overline{D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}} \right|.$$

We may repeat this argument for each type-A set S in $\mathcal{Q}$, apply the triangle inequality to the resulting sum, and bound terms of the form $|D(s)_{jj}|$ by $\|D(s)\|$ and the cardinality of distinct indices in $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}'$ by $4M$. Denoting by $\#A$ the number of such type-A sets, by $\mathcal{S}_M \subseteq [M]_{\times 4}$ the union of all such type-A sets, by $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{S}_M$ the partition of $[M]_{\times 4} \setminus \mathcal{S}_M$ with all type-A sets removed,

and by $\mathcal{S}_K \subseteq \{1,\dots,K\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}'_K \subseteq \{1,\dots,K\}$) those indices s for which $M(s) \in [M]_J$ and $M(s)+1 \in [M]_I$ (resp. $M(s) \in [M]'_J$ and $M(s)+1 \in [M]'_I$) do not form type-A sets, this implies

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) \leq \left(4M \max_k \|D_k\|\right)^{\#A} \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus \mathcal{S}_M | \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{S}_M} \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}_K} \left|D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}}\right| \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}'_K} \left|D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}\right|,$$

where $(4M \max_k \|D_k\|)^{\#A} \leq C$ for some constant $C := C_M > 0$.

Now suppose $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{S}_M$ contains some type-B set S with $|S| = 2$. For notational convenience, suppose S consists of $M(1) \in [M]_J$ and $M(2) \in [M]_J$ (so $j_{M(1)} = j_{M(2)}$, and this is distinct from all other indices). Then, separating out the sum over $j_{M(1)}$, we may write (using notation defined similarly as above)

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) \leq C \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup S) | \mathcal{Q} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup S)} \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\dots,\min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2})\} \\ j \notin \mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup S)}} \left|D(1)_{j i_{M(1)+1}} D(2)_{j i_{M(2)+1}}\right|$$
$$\prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}_K \setminus \{1,2\}} \left|D(s)_{j_{M(s)} i_{M(s)+1}}\right| \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}'_K} \left|D(s)_{j'_{M(s)} i'_{M(s)+1}}\right|.$$

Consider matrices $P(1) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{r_1} \times \min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2})}$ and $P(2) \in \mathbb{C}^{\min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2}) \times N_{r_2}}$ with all off-diagonal entries equal to 0 and all diagonal entries of modulus 1, such that $P(1)_{jj} D(1)_{j i_{M(1)+1}} = |D(1)_{j i_{M(1)+1}}|$ and $P(2)_{jj} D(2)_{j i_{M(2)+1}} = |D(2)_{j i_{M(2)+1}}|$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2})$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\dots,\min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2})\} \\ j \notin \mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup S)}} \left|D(1)_{j i_{M(1)+1}} D(2)_{j i_{M(2)+1}}\right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\min(N_{r_1}, N_{r_2})} \left|D(1)_{j i_{M(1)+1}} D(2)_{j i_{M(2)+1}}\right|$$
$$= (D(1)^T P(1) P(2) D(2))_{i_{M(1)+1} i_{M(2)+1}}$$
$$\leq \|D(1)^T P(1) P(2) D(2)\| \leq C,$$

for a constant $C > 0$. Applying this bound, repeating this argument for each type-B set S in $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{S}_M$, and denoting $\mathcal{S}'_M$ as the union of all such type-B sets, we obtain

$$D(\mathcal{Q}) \leq C \sum_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M) | \mathcal{Q} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)} \prod_{t=1}^{T} |D(s_t)_{a_t b_t}|$$

for some constants C and T depending on M and K, some indices $s_1,\dots,s_T \in \{1,\dots,K\}$, and some indices a_t and b_t belonging to $\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)$.

The partition $\mathcal{Q} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)$ no longer has any sets of cardinality 2. Hence all sets of $\mathcal{Q} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)$ have cardinality at least 4, implying that $\mathcal{Q} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)$ contains at most M sets. This means there are at most M distinct indices among $\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',\mathbf{j},\mathbf{j}' \setminus (\mathcal{S}_M \cup \mathcal{S}'_M)$. Each such distinct index can take at most N different values, so we obtain $D(\mathcal{Q}) \leq CN^M$ for some $C := C_M > 0$. This holds for all good partitions $\mathcal{Q}$, and there are at most C_M such good partitions, so $\mathcal{E} \leq CN^{-2}$ for some $C := C_M > 0$. The desired result follows by Markov's inequality and the Borel-Cantelli lemma. □

The remainder of the proof of Theorem 3.17 is similar to that of [BG09, Theorem 1.6]:

Lemma B.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.17, fix $K \geq 1$, $j_1,\dots,j_K \in \{1,\dots,J\}$, and $r_1,\dots,r_K \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. For each $k = 1,\dots,K$, let Q_k be a polynomial with coefficients in $\langle P_1,\dots,P_d\rangle$ of the variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}$ of the single family $\mathcal{I}_{j_k}$, such that $P_{r_k} Q_k P_{r_{k+1}} = Q_k$ (with the identification $r_{K+1} := r_1$). Let $q_1,\dots,q_K$ denote the corresponding polynomials with coefficients*

in $\langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle$*. Then, almost surely as* $N \to \infty$*,*

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} - \tau \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) \right| \to 0. \tag{63}$$

Proof. We induct on K. For $K = 1$, any $j_1 \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$, and any polynomial Q_1 of $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_1}}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} Q_1(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_1}} - \tau \left(q_1(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_1}} \right) \right| \to 0$$

a.s. by the assumption that $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}$ and $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}$ are asymptotically equal in $\mathcal{D}$-law a.s.

For $K \geq 2$, assume inductively that the result holds for $1, \ldots, K-1$. Denote for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$

$$D_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} = Q_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} - \left(\frac{1}{N_{r_k}} \operatorname{Tr} \left(Q_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) \right) P_{r_k},$$

noting that $\operatorname{Tr} Q_k = 0$ and $D_k = Q_k$ if $r_k \neq r_{k+1}$, and $\operatorname{Tr} D_k = 0$ if $r_k = r_{k+1}$. Denote $\mathcal{S}_K$ as the collection of all subsets of $\{k : r_k = r_{k+1}\}$. Then, applying a binomial expansion,

$$\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_K} Q(S)$$

where

$$Q(S) := \left(\prod_{k \in S} \frac{1}{N_{r_k}} \operatorname{Tr} \left(Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) \right) \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \setminus S} D_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}.$$

By Definition 3.16 of the free deterministic equivalent and the condition $c < N_r/N < C$, for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$, a.s. as $N \to \infty$

$$\left| \frac{N}{\operatorname{Tr} P_{r_k}} - \frac{1}{\tau(p_{r_k})} \right| = \left| \frac{N}{N_{r_k}} - \frac{1}{\tau(p_{r_k})} \right| \to 0$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \left(Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) - \tau(q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}) \right| \to 0.$$

Furthermore, each D_k is a polynomial of variables in the single family $\mathcal{I}_{j_k}$, satisfying $P_{r_k} D_k P_{r_{k+1}} = D_k$. Hence, for every $S \neq \emptyset$, applying the induction hypothesis, a.s. as $N \to \infty$,

$$\left| Q(S) - \left(\prod_{k \in S} \frac{1}{\tau(p_{r_k})} \tau(q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}) \right) \tau \left(\prod_{k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \setminus S} d_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) \right| \to 0, \tag{64}$$

where d_k is the analogue of D_k in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$:

$$d_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} = q_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} - \left(\frac{1}{\tau(p_{r_k})} \tau(q_k(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}) \right) p_{r_k}.$$

For $S = \emptyset$, first suppose that $j_k = j_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ (or $j_K = j_1$). Then combining $D_k D_{k+1}$ into a single polynomial (and applying cyclic invariance of Tr and τ if $j_K = j_1$), the induction hypothesis still yields (64). Now suppose $j_k \neq j_{k+1}$ for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Note, by construction, $\tau(p_r d_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} p_r) = 0$ for each $r = 1, \ldots, d$ and $k = 1, \ldots, K$, so by freeness of $(h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}, \ldots, (h_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}$ with amalgamation over $\langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle$,

$$\tau \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} d_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) = 0.$$

To verify that $Q(\emptyset) \to 0$, let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \mathbb{N}}$, and introduce random matrices $(O(j, r))_{j \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \{1, \ldots, d\}}$ that are independent of each other and of $\mathcal{H}$ and such that

each $O(j,r)$ is Haar-distributed over the orthogonal group in $\mathbb{R}^{N_r \times N_r}$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, define the block diagonal matrix $O(j) = \operatorname{diag}(O(j,1), \ldots, O(j,d))$. By orthogonal invariance in law of $(H_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}$, we have the equality in distribution

$$Q(\emptyset) = \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} D_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \overset{L}{=} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} O(j_k) D_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} O(j_k)^{-1}.$$

Write $\tilde{D}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{r_k} \times N_{r_{k+1}}}$ as the non-zero block of D_k. Then the above may be written as

$$Q(\emptyset) \overset{L}{=} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} O(j_k, r_k) \tilde{D}_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} O(j_k, r_{k+1})^{-1}.$$

Conditional on $\mathcal{H}$, $\tilde{D}_k$ are deterministic, $\|\tilde{D}_k\| \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$ (depending on the original polynomials $Q_1, \ldots, Q_K$) and all large N a.s., and $O(j,r)$ are still Haar-distributed orthogonal matrices. Writing

$$O(j_k, r_k) \tilde{D}_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} O(j_k, r_{k+1})^{-1} = O(j_k, r_k) \tilde{D}_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} O(j_k, r_{k+1})^{-1} \operatorname{Id}_{N_{r_{k+1}}}$$

and recalling that for each k, $j_k \neq j_{k+1}$ and $\operatorname{Tr} \tilde{D}_k = \operatorname{Tr} D_k = 0$ if $r_k = r_{k+1}$, Lemma B.2 implies, conditionally on $\mathcal{H}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \prod_{k=1}^{K} O(j_k, r_k) \tilde{D}_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} O(j_k, r_{k+1})^{-1} \to 0$$

a.s. Then this must also hold unconditionally a.s., which implies by the equality in distribution above that $Q(\emptyset) \to 0$ a.s. Thus (64) holds for $S = \emptyset$ and hence for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_K$. Finally, note that

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_K} \left(\prod_{k \in S} \frac{1}{\tau(p_{r_k})} \tau(q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}) \right) \tau \left(\prod_{k \in \{1,\ldots,K\} \setminus S} d_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) = \tau \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right).$$

This establishes (63), completing the induction. □

Proof of Theorem 3.17. We wish to show, for any polynomial P in the non-commutative variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}$ with coefficients in $\langle P_1, \ldots, P_d \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$, and with p denoting the corresponding polynomial with coefficients in $\langle p_1, \ldots, p_d \rangle \subset \mathcal{A}$, that almost surely as $N \to \infty$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} P(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}} - \tau(p(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}}) \right| \to 0. \tag{65}$$

By linearity of Tr and τ, it suffices to consider the case where

$$P(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j, j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}} = \prod_{k=1}^{K} Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \tag{66}$$

for some $K \geq 1$, indices $j_1, \ldots, j_K \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$, and polynomials $Q_1, \ldots, Q_K$ where each Q_k is a polynomial (with coefficients in $\langle P_1, \ldots, P_d \rangle$) in the variables $(x_i, x_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}}$ of a single family $\mathcal{I}_{j_k}$. Writing $Q_k = (P_1 + \ldots + P_d) Q_k (P_1 + \ldots + P_d)$ and again applying linearity of Tr and τ, it suffices to consider the case where each Q_k is simple-valued, i.e. $P_{r_k} Q_k P_{s_k} = Q_k$ for some $r_k, s_k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. Let q_k denote the polynomial in $\mathcal{A}$ corresponding to Q_k. If $s_k \neq r_{k+1}$ for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ (with $r_{K+1} := r_1$), then clearly

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} Q_k(H_i, H_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) = \tau \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K} q_k(h_i, h_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{j_k}} \right) = 0,$$

so the result holds. If $s_k = r_{k+1}$ for all k, the result follows from Lemma B.3. □

Proof of Corollary 3.23. Under the given conditions, there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that $|\tau(w^l)| \le C_0^l$ for all N and $l \ge 0$, and also $|N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} W^l| \le \|W\|^l \le C_0^l$ a.s. for all $l \ge 0$ and all sufficiently large N. Fix $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ with $|z| > C_0$. Then $G_w^{\mathbb{C}}(z) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)} \tau(w^l)$ and $m_W(z) = -N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}(z - W)^{-1} = -N^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)} N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} W^l$ define convergent series a.s. for all large N. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists L such that

$$\left| \sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)} N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} W^l \right| < \varepsilon, \quad \left| \sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} z^{-(l+1)} \tau(w^l) \right| < \varepsilon$$

a.s. for all large N, while by Theorem 3.17, a.s. as $N \to \infty$

$$\left| \sum_{l=0}^{L} z^{-(l+1)} N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr} W^l - z^{-(l+1)} \tau(w^l) \right| \to 0.$$

Hence $\limsup_{N \to \infty} |m_W(z) - m_w(z)| \le \varepsilon$ a.s., and the result follows by taking $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

Appendix C. Analysis of fixed-point equations

In this appendix, we prove Lemmas 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6, following arguments similar to those in [CDS11] and [DL11].

Proof of Lemma 4.4. The result is originally due to [CL11]. It also follows by the theory of normal families: $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a normal family by Montel's fundamental normality test, see e.g. [Sch13, Section 2.7]. Hence every subsequence has a further subsequence that converges uniformly on compact sets to an analytic function. All such analytic functions must coincide on E, hence they coincide on all of Ω by uniqueness of analytic extensions, implying the desired result. □

Proof of Lemma 4.5. For any $v \in \mathbb{C}^p$, $\Im[v^*(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_s b_s H_s^* H_s)v] = (\Im z)v^*v + \sum_s (\Im b_s) v^* H_s^* H_s v > 0$. Hence $z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_s b_s H_s^* H_s$ is invertible. Letting $T = (z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_s b_s H_s^* H_s)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} n_r f_r(z, b_1, \ldots, b_k) &= -\operatorname{Tr} T H_r^* H_r = -\operatorname{Tr} T H_r^* H_r T^* \left(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^{k} b_s H_s^* H_s \right)^* \\ &= -\overline{z} \operatorname{Tr} T H_r^* H_r T^* - \sum_{s=1}^{k} \overline{b_s} \operatorname{Tr} T H_r^* H_r T^* H_s^* H_s. \end{aligned}$$

As $\operatorname{Tr} TRT^*S$ is real and nonnegative for any Hermitian positive-semidefinite matrices R and S, the above implies $\Im f_r(z, b_1, \ldots, b_k) \ge 0$. In fact, as $\operatorname{Tr} T H_r^* H_r T^* > 0$ unless $H_r = 0$, either $\Im f_r(z, b_1, \ldots, b_k) > 0$ or $f_r(z, b_1, \ldots, b_k) = 0$. Similarly,

$$p m_0(z) = -\operatorname{Tr} T = -\overline{z} \operatorname{Tr} T T^* - \sum_{s=1}^{k} \overline{b_s} \operatorname{Tr} T T^* H_s^* H_s,$$

and as $\operatorname{Tr} TT^* > 0$, $\Im m_0(z) > 0$. This establishes (a).

For (b), let us first show $\operatorname{Id}_{n_1 + \ldots + n_k} + BD(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ is invertible. Note if $a_1 = 0$, then by the fact that a block matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible if and only if A and C are invertible, it suffices to show invertibility of the lower-right $(n_2 + \ldots + n_k) \times (n_2 + \ldots + n_k)$ submatrix. Hence we may reduce to the case where $a_s \ne 0$, i.e. $a_s \in \mathbb{C}^+$, for all s. Suppose $\operatorname{rank}(B) = m$ and let $B^\dagger$ denote the pseudo-inverse of B, so that $BB^\dagger$ is a projection matrix of rank m onto the column span of B. $B^\dagger$ is Hermitian, since B is. Let Q denote the projection orthogonal to $BB^\dagger$, of rank $n_1 + \ldots + n_k - m$. Then

$$\operatorname{Id}_{n_1 + \ldots + n_k} + BD(a_1, \ldots, a_k) = Q + B(B^\dagger + D(a_1, \ldots, a_k)).$$

For each $s = 1, \dots, k$, let P_s be the projection onto the n_s coordinates of the s^{th} block of $\mathbb{C}^{n_1+\dots+n_k}$, so $D(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \sum_{s=1}^k a_s P_s$. Then for any $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1+\dots+n_k}$,

$$\Im[v^*(B^\dagger + D(a_1, \dots, a_k))v] = \Im[v^* D(a_1, \dots, a_k)v] = \sum_s (\Im a_s) v^* P_s v > 0,$$

as $v^* B^\dagger v$ and $v^* P_s v$ are real and $\Im a_s > 0$ for each s. Hence $B^\dagger + D(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ is invertible, so $\mathrm{Id}_{n_1+\dots+n_k} + BD(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ is of full column rank and thus also invertible.

For the second claim, supposing momentarily that B is invertible and letting $M = (B^{-1} + D(a_1, \dots, a_k))^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} n_r g_r(a_1, \dots, a_k) = -\operatorname{Tr} M_{r,r} &= -\operatorname{Tr}\left(M \left(B^{-1} + \sum_{s=1}^k a_s P_s \right)^* M^* \right)_{r,r} \\ &= -\operatorname{Tr} P_r M B^{-1} M^* - \sum_{s=1}^k \overline{a_s} \operatorname{Tr} P_r M P_s M^*. \end{aligned}$$

As $\operatorname{Tr} P_r M B^{-1} M^*$ is real and $\operatorname{Tr} P_r M P_s M^*$ is real and nonnegative, this implies $\Im g_r(a_1, \dots, a_k) \geq 0$. By continuity in B, this must hold also when B is not invertible, establishing (b). □

Proof of Lemma 4.6. For part (a), ρ is clearly nonnegative, symmetric, and satisfies the triangle inequality. By definition of $\mathcal{S}$, $\rho(b, \tilde{b}) < \infty$ for all $b, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{S}$. By uniqueness of analytic extensions, $\rho(b, \tilde{b}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow b = \tilde{b}$, hence ρ is a metric. If $\{b^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{S}, \rho)$, then for each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ with $\Im z > M$, $\{b^{(l)}(z)\}_{l=1}^\infty$ is Cauchy in $(\overline{\mathbb{C}^+})^k$ and hence converges to some $b(z) = (b_1(z), \dots, b_k(z)) \in (\overline{\mathbb{C}^+})^k$. Then Lemma 4.4 implies each $b_r(z)$ has an analytic extension to all of $\mathbb{C}^+$, and $b_r^{(l)} \to b_r$ uniformly over compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}^+$. This implies $b_r(z) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \Im z > M} \|b(z)\| \leq C$, so $b \in \mathcal{S}$. Furthermore $\rho(b^{(l)}, b) \to 0$, hence $(\mathcal{S}, \rho)$ is complete.

For part (b), clearly if $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ is a k-tuple of analytic functions on $\mathbb{C}^+$, then $g(f(z, b))$ is as well. Now consider $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ with $\Im z > M$ and fixed values $b \in (\overline{\mathbb{C}^+})^k$ with $\|b\| \leq C$, and define

$$T = \left(z \operatorname{Id}_p + \sum_{s=1}^k b_s H_s^* H_s \right)^{-1}, \quad R = \left(\mathrm{Id}_{n_1+\dots+n_k} + BD(f(z, b)) \right)^{-1}, \tag{67}$$

where invertibility of these quantities follows from Lemma 4.5. Since $H_s^* H_s$ is positive-semidefinite, [CDS11, Lemma 8] implies $\|T\| \leq (\Im z)^{-1}$. Then if $C, M > 0$ (depending on $p, n_r, m_r, H_r, B_{r,s}$) are sufficiently large, we have $|f_r(z, b)| \leq C(\Im z)^{-1}$, $\|BD(f(z, b))\| < 1/2$, $\|R\| < 2$, and $\|g(f(z, b))\| \leq C$. This establishes that for sufficiently large $C, M > 0$, if $b \in \mathcal{S}$, then $g(f(z, b)) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Next, consider also $\tilde{b} \in (\overline{\mathbb{C}^+})^k$ with $\|\tilde{b}\| \leq C$, and define $\tilde{T}$ and $\tilde{R}$ by (67) with $\tilde{b}$ in place of b. For each $s = 1, \dots, k$, let P_s be the projection onto the n_s coordinates of the s^{th} block of $\mathbb{C}^{n_1+\dots+n_k}$, so $D(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \sum_{s=1}^k a_s P_s$. Then by the matrix identity $A^{-1} - (A+E)^{-1} = A^{-1}E(A+E)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(z, b) - f_r(z, \tilde{b}) &= \frac{1}{n_r} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{T}(T^{-1} - \tilde{T}^{-1}) T H_r^* H_r \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{s=1}^k (b_s - \tilde{b}_s) \operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{T} H_s^* H_s T H_r^* H_r \right), \\ g_r(f(z, b)) - g_r(f(z, \tilde{b})) &= \frac{1}{n_r} \operatorname{Tr} P_r \tilde{R}(R^{-1} - \tilde{R}^{-1}) R B \\ &= \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{s=1}^k (f_s(z, b) - f_s(z, \tilde{b})) \operatorname{Tr} P_r \tilde{R} B P_s R B. \end{aligned}$$

Then $g(f(z,b)) - g(f(z,\tilde{b})) = M^{(2)}M^{(1)}(b-\tilde{b})$ for the matrices $M^{(1)}, M^{(2)} \in \mathbb{C}^{k\times k}$ having entries

$$M^{(1)}_{rs} = \frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{T}H_s^* H_s T H_r^* H_r\right), \quad M^{(2)}_{rs} = \frac{1}{n_r}\operatorname{Tr} P_r \tilde{R} B P_s R B.$$

For sufficiently large $C, M > 0$, we have $\|T\| \leq (\Im z)^{-1}$, $\|\tilde{T}\| \leq (\Im z)^{-1}$, $\|M^{(1)}\| \leq C(\Im z)^{-2}$, $\|R\| < 2$, $\|\tilde{R}\| < 2$, and $\|M^{(2)}\| \leq C$, hence $\|M^{(2)}M^{(1)}\| \leq C^2(\Im z)^{-2} \leq C^2 M^{-2}$. Increasing M if necessary so that $C^2M^{-2} < 1$, this yields part (b). □

Appendix D. Free probability details

In this appendix, we discuss some of the functional-analytic details of the free probability framework, and we prove Lemma 4.2.

The following background on von Neumann algebras may be found in [Mur90, Bla06]: Let $B(H)$ be the space of all bounded linear operators on a separable complex Hilbert space H. $B(H)$ has the structure of a $*$-algebra, with the conjugate-linear involution $* : B(H) \to B(H)$ given by the adjoint map. An operator $a \in B(H)$ is positive if $a = b^*b$ for some $b \in B(H)$, in which case there is a unique such b that is also positive, and we write $b = a^{1/2}$. For any $a \in B(H)$, we write $|a| = (a^*a)^{1/2}$. An operator $b \in B(H)$ is trace-class if, for any orthonormal basis $(\psi_k)_k$ of H, $\sum_k \langle |b|\psi_k, \psi_k\rangle$ is finite. If b is trace-class, then ab is also trace-class for any $a \in B(H)$, and the ultraweak (or σ-weak) topology on $B(H)$ is the weakest topology for which the map $a \mapsto \sum_k \langle ab\psi_k, \psi_k\rangle$ is continuous for every trace-class operator b. A von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ over $\mathbb{C}$ is any ultraweakly closed sub-$*$-algebra of $B(H)$, for some separable Hilbert space H, that contains the identity operator which is the unit $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{A}$. The ultraweak topology is weaker than the norm topology given by the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ on H. Hence if $\mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra, then it is also closed under $\|\cdot\|$, so in particular it is a C^*-algebra.

For a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a linear functional $\tau : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ is positive if $\tau(a^*a) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, normal if τ is ultraweakly continuous, and faithful if $\tau(a^*a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$. For $\mathcal{B}$ a second von Neumann algebra, a linear functional $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is positive if for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathbf{F}(a^*a) = b^*b$, normal if $\mathbf{F}$ is continuous with respect to the ultraweak topology on both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, and faithful if $\mathbf{F}(a^*a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a von Neumann sub-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ is a positive, normal, faithful conditional expectation in the sense of Definition 3.4, then it is in fact a completely positive map (see e.g. [Spe98, Proposition 3.5.4]), which implies $\|\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}(a)\| \leq \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ is norm-continuous. Similarly, if τ is a positive, normal, faithful trace in the sense of Definition 3.1, then $|\tau(a)| \leq \|a\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and τ is norm-continuous. This verifies that (23) and (24) define convergent series for sufficiently small $\|b^{-1}\|$ and $\|b\|$, respectively.

In the von Neumann algebra setting, the following proposition guarantees the existence and uniqueness of conditional expectations, which obey a "tower property" analogous to that of conditional expectations for classical random variables:

Proposition D.1. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a non-commutative probability space such that $\mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra and τ is a positive, normal, faithful trace.*

(a) For any von Neumann sub-algebra $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, there exists a unique τ-invariant conditional expectation $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$, and $\mathbf{F}^{B}$ is positive, normal, and faithful.

(b) For von Neumann sub-algebras $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, if $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$, $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$, and $\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{D}$ are τ-invariant conditional expectations, then $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{D}} = \mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{D}} \circ \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof of Proposition D.1. (a) follows from [Ume54, Theorems 1 and 2]. (In [Ume54], τ-invariance of $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ is verified in eq. (1), and any τ-invariant $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfies condition (ix) as verified in the proof of Theorem 1, hence uniqueness follows from Theorem 2.) (b) follows from the uniqueness statement in (a), as $\mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{\mathcal{D}} \circ \mathbf{F}^{\mathcal{B}}$ are both τ-invariant conditional expectations from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{D}$. □

It is easily verified that in the setting of the above proposition, the sub-$*$-algebra $\mathcal{D}$ defined in (15) is ultraweakly closed, hence $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_k \rangle_{W^*}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a von Neumann sub-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathbf{F}$ defined by (16) is the unique τ-compatible conditional expectation $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{D}$.

The next lemma verifies that the algebraic models in the examples of Section 3 may be constructed in this von Neumann algebra setting.

Lemma D.2. *Rectangular probability spaces $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_1, \ldots, p_d)$ satisfying the properties of Examples 3.13, 3.14, and 3.15 exist, such that $\mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra and τ is a positive, normal, faithful trace.*

Proof. In each of the examples, let $\mathcal{A}$ be the space of $N \times N$ matrices whose elements are bounded complex-valued random variables on some (classical) probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$. Let H be the Hilbert space of length-N vectors whose elements are complex-valued random variables on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ having finite second moment, with inner-product $v, w \mapsto \mathbb{E}\langle v, w \rangle$ where $\mathbb{E}$ denotes expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner-product in $\mathbb{C}^N$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ acts on H via left-multiplication and is a von Neumann sub-algebra of $B(H)$. Defining the trace $\tau = \mathbb{E} \circ N^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}$, τ is positive, normal, and faithful. Letting $P_1, \ldots, P_d \in \mathcal{A}$ be the (deterministic) projection matrices in Example 3.3, $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, P_1, \ldots, P_d)$ is a rectangular probability space. For Example 3.13, the element $g \in \mathcal{A}$ may be realized as the matrix with (r, r) block equal to $X \operatorname{Id}_{N_r \times N_r}$ and (s, t) block equal to 0 for all other (s, t), where X is a random variable on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ with semi-circle law. For Example 3.14, the element $g \in \mathcal{A}$ may be realized as the matrix with (r_1, r_2) block equal to $X \operatorname{Id}_{N_{r_1} \times N_{r_2}}$ and (s, t) block equal to 0 for all other (s, t), where X is any random variable such that $|X|^2$ has the Marcenko-Pastur law (19) with $\lambda = N_{r_2}/N_{r_1}$. (Here, $\operatorname{Id}_{N_{r_1} \times N_{r_2}}$ denotes the rectangular matrix whose (j, j) element is 1 for each $1 \leq j \leq \min(r_1, r_2)$ and whose remaining elements are 0.) For Example 3.15, the elements $b_1, \ldots, b_k \in \mathcal{A}$ may simply be realized as the original (deterministic) matrices $B_1, \ldots, B_k$. □

Finally, we prove Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. For each of the $k+2$ families $\{h_r\}$, $\{b_{rs}\}$, $g_1, \ldots, g_k$, a rectangular probability space $(\mathcal{A}^{(j)}, \tau^{(j)}, p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ (for $j = 1, \ldots, k+2$) containing the elements of that family and satisfying the relevant conditions in 1–4 exists by Example 3.14 or 3.15 and Lemma D.2. In each case $\mathcal{A}$ is constructed as a von Neumann algebra and τ as a positive, normal, faithful state. Then by the construction of a finite von Neumann free product with amalgamation over $\mathcal{D} = \langle p_0, \ldots, p_{2k} \rangle$, see [Pop93, Section 3], there exists a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with trace τ such that each $\mathcal{A}^{(j)}$ is identified as a von Neumann sub-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$ and contains the common sub-algebra $\mathcal{D}$, $\tau|_{A^{(j)}} = \tau^{(j)}$ for each j, and $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}^{(k+2)}$ are free with amalgamation over $\mathcal{D}$. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \tau, p_0, \ldots, p_{2k})$ satisfies conditions (a), (c), and (e) of the lemma. Condition (b) follows from Proposition D.1. For condition (d), note that by (33–35) and the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\tau((h_r^* h_r)^l) \leq C^l$, $\tau((g_r^* g_r)^l) \leq C^l$, and $\tau((b_{rs}^* b_{rs})^l) \leq C^l$ for all N, all $r, s = 1, \ldots, k$, and all $l \geq 0$. Then condition (d) follows from linearity of τ and the non-commutative Hölder inequality, see [Dix53, Theorem 6]. □

References

[BAC+15] Mark W Blows, Scott L Allen, Julie M Collet, Stephen F Chenoweth, and Katrina McGuigan. The phenome-wide distribution of genetic variance. *The American Naturalist*, 186(1):15–30, 2015.

[Bar90] NH Barton. Pleiotropic models of quantitative variation. *Genetics*, 124(3):773–782, 1990.

[BCY10] Zhidong Bai, Jiaqi Chen, and Jianfeng Yao. On estimation of the population spectral distribution from a high-dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 52(4):423–437, 2010.

[BG09] Florent Benaych-Georges. Rectangular random matrices, related convolution. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 144(3-4):471–515, 2009.

[BGN11] Florent Benaych-Georges and Raj Rao Nadakuditi. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices. *Advances in Mathematics*, 227(1):494–521, 2011.

[Bla06] Bruce Blackadar. *Operator algebras: Theory of C*-algebras and von Neumann algebras*, volume 122. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[Blo07] Mark W Blows. A tale of two matrices: Multivariate approaches in evolutionary biology. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 20(1):1–8, 2007.

[BM15] Mark W Blows and Katrina McGuigan. The distribution of genetic variance across phenotypic space and the response to selection. *Molecular ecology*, 24(9):2056–2072, 2015.

[BS06] Jinho Baik and Jack W Silverstein. Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 97(6):1382–1408, 2006.

[BS10] Zhidong Bai and Jack W Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, volume 20. Springer, 2010.

[BY12] Zhidong Bai and Jianfeng Yao. On sample eigenvalues in a generalized spiked population model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 106:167–177, 2012.

[CDS11] Romain Couillet, Mérouane Debbah, and Jack W Silverstein. A deterministic equivalent for the analysis of correlated MIMO multiple access channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(6):3493–3514, 2011.

[CL11] C Caratheéodory and E Landau. Beiträge zur konvergenz von funktionenfolgen. *Sitz. Ber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., Phys.-math.*, 26:587–613, 1911.

[Col03] Benoît Collins. Moments and cumulants of polynomial random variables on unitary groups, the Itzykson-Zuber integral, and free probability. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2003(17):953–982, 2003.

[CR48] Ralph E Comstock and Harold F Robinson. The components of genetic variance in populations of biparental progenies and their use in estimating the average degree of dominance. *Biometrics*, 4(4):254–266, 1948.

[CŚ06] Benoît Collins and Piotr Śniady. Integration with respect to the Haar measure on unitary, orthogonal and symplectic group. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 264(3):773–795, 2006.

[Dix53] Jacques Dixmier. Formes linéaires sur un anneau d'opérateurs. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 81:9–39, 1953.

[DL11] Florian Dupuy and Philippe Loubaton. On the capacity achieving covariance matrix for frequency selective MIMO channels using the asymptotic approach. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(9):5737–5753, 2011.

[Dyk93] Ken Dykema. On certain free product factors via an extended matrix model. *Journal of functional analysis*, 112(1):31–60, 1993.

[Fis18] Ronald A Fisher. The correlation between relatives on the supposition of Mendelian inheritance. *Transactions of the royal society of Edinburgh*, 52(02):399–433, 1918.

[GH03] Jeffrey S Geronimo and Theodore P Hill. Necessary and sufficient condition that the limit of Stieltjes transforms is a Stieltjes transform. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 121(1):54–60, 2003.

[HLN07] Walid Hachem, Philippe Loubaton, and Jamal Najim. Deterministic equivalents for certain functionals of large random matrices. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 17(3):875–930, 2007.

[HMB14] Emma Hine, Katrina McGuigan, and Mark W Blows. Evolutionary constraints in high-dimensional trait sets. *The American Naturalist*, 184(1):119–131, 2014.

[HP00] Fumio Hiai and Denes Petz. Asymptotic freeness almost everywhere for random matrices. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 66(3–4):809–834, 2000.

[Kar08] Noureddine El Karoui. Spectrum estimation for large dimensional covariance matrices using random matrix theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(6):2757–2790, 2008.

[Kir09] Mark Kirkpatrick. Patterns of quantitative genetic variation in multiple dimensions. *Genetica*, 136(2):271–284, 2009.

[KO61] Oscar Kempthorne and Richard H Osborne. The interpretation of twin data. *American journal of human genetics*, 13(3):320, 1961.

[LA83] Russell Lande and Stevan J Arnold. The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution*, 37(6):1210–1226, 1983.

[LaM73] Lynn R LaMotte. Quadratic estimation of variance components. *Biometrics*, 29(2):311–330, 1973.

[Lix06] Zhang Lixin. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*. PhD thesis, National University of Singapore, 2006.

[LW98] Michael Lynch and Bruce Walsh. *Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits*, volume 1. Sinauer Sunderland, MA, 1998.

[LW12] Olivier Ledoit and Michael Wolf. Nonlinear shrinkage estimation of large-dimensional covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2), 2012.

[MCM+14] Katrina McGuigan, Julie M Collet, Elizabeth A McGraw, H Ye Yixin, Scott L Allen, Stephen F Chenoweth, and Mark W Blows. The nature and extent of mutational pleiotropy in gene expression of male drosophila serrata. *Genetics*, 196(3):911–921, 2014.

[Mes08] Xavier Mestre. Improved estimation of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of covariance matrices using their sample estimates. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(11):5113–5129, 2008.

[MP67] Vladimir A Marčenko and Leonid Andreevich Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 1(4):457–483, 1967.

[MS07] Aris L Moustakas and Steven H Simon. On the outage capacity of correlated multiple-path MIMO channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 53(11):3887–3903, 2007.

[Mur90] G.J. Murphy. *C*-algebras and Operator Theory*. Academic Press, 1990.

[NC76] Walter E Nance and Linda A Corey. Genetic models for the analysis of data from the families of identical twins. *Genetics*, 83(4):811–826, 1976.

[NSS02] Alexandru Nica, Dimitri Shlyakhtenko, and Roland Speicher. Operator-valued distributions. I. Characterizations of freeness. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2002(29):1509–1538, 2002.

[PA89] Patrick C Phillips and Stevan J Arnold. Visualizing multivariate selection. *Evolution*, pages 1209–1222, 1989.

[PA14] Debashis Paul and Alexander Aue. Random matrix theory in statistics: A review. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 150:1–29, 2014.

[Pau07] Debashis Paul. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1617–1642, 2007.

[Pop93] Sorin Popa. Markov traces on universal Jones algebras and subfactors of finite index. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 111(1):375–405, 1993.

[Rao72] C Radhakrishna Rao. Estimation of variance and covariance components in linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 67(337):112–115, 1972.

[RMSE08] N Raj Rao, James A Mingo, Roland Speicher, and Alan Edelman. Statistical eigen-inference from large Wishart matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2850–2885, 2008.

[Rob59a] Alan Robertson. Experimental design in the evaluation of genetic parameters. *Biometrics*, 15(2):219–226, 1959.

[Rob59b] Alan Robertson. The sampling variance of the genetic correlation coefficient. *Biometrics*, 15(3):469–485, 1959.

[SB95] Jack W Silverstein and Zhidong Bai. On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of a class of large dimensional random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate analysis*, 54(2):175–192, 1995.

[Sch13] Joel L Schiff. *Normal families*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[SCM09] Shayle R Searle, George Casella, and Charles E McCulloch. *Variance components*, volume 391. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

[Spe98] Roland Speicher. *Combinatorial theory of the free product with amalgamation and operator-valued free probability theory*, volume 627. American Mathematical Soc., 1998.

[SR74] SR Searle and TR Rounsaville. A note on estimating covariance components. *The American Statistician*, 28(2):67–68, 1974.

[SV12] Roland Speicher and Carlos Vargas. Free deterministic equivalents, rectangular random matrix models, and operator-valued free probability theory. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 1(02):1150008, 2012.

[Ume54] Hisaharu Umegaki. Conditional expectation in an operator algebra. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 6(2-3):177–181, 1954.

[VDN92] D V Voiculescu, K J Dykema, and A Nica. *Free Random Variables*. CRM Monograph Series. American Mathematical Soc., 1992.

[Voi91] Dan Voiculescu. Limit laws for random matrices and free products. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 104(1):201–220, 1991.

[Voi95] Dan Voiculescu. Operations on certain non-commutative operator-valued random variables. *Recent advances in operator algebras (Orléans, 1992)*, Astérisque(232):243–275, 1995.

[Voi98] Dan Voiculescu. A strengthened asymptotic freeness result for random matrices with applications to free entropy. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 1998(1):41–63, 1998.

[WB09] Bruce Walsh and Mark W Blows. Abundant genetic variation+strong selection=multivariate genetic constraints: A geometric view of adaptation. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 40:41–59, 2009.

[YBK88] Yong-Qua Yin, Zhi-Dong Bai, and Pathak R Krishnaiah. On the limit of the largest eigenvalue of the large dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Probability theory and related fields*, 78(4):509–521, 1988.